The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1892.

The Week.

WE are not among those who desired to have the vote on the Bland Silver Bill postponed till the next session of Congress. On the contrary, we think that it is altogether desirable that the people should know before the Presidential campaign begins what they can depend upon. There ought to be no concealment of the issues of the campaign. If the silver question is an issue at all, it will be the overshadowing and controlling one. It will be so because it does not admit of dallying or postponement. The tariff question we have had with us for a hundred years, more or less. A few years more will not make much difference in the total. The silver question has such sudden and tremendous consequences that the people will and must make it paramount to everything else. We do not attach much importance to the vote taken on Monday. It was quite proper that a time should be set for considering the Bland Bill. We find no fault with the forty-nine Republicans who voted with the majority to fix a day for its consideration. Most of those who so voted are opposed to free coinage. All of them probably voted as they did in order to gain a political advantage. For this they cannot be blamed. The preliminary skirmish settles nothing to the disadvantage of the country. If the Republicans are wise, they will vote against the bill when it comes to a vote, because in no other way can they make the issue sharp and decisive, as they must make it in order to win. If it can be said in the campaign that they are just as bad as the Democrats, then the contest will turn solely on the goodness of the candidates.

The Pension Bill is bringing out the annual display of partisan recrimination. The dominant party in the House, responsible for expenditures, is always held up as the enemy of the old soldier because it will not vote unlimited millions for him, while the minority, able to display its consuming love for pensioners by the inexpensive process of introducing lavish measures which have no chance of passing, is always able to pose as the only true friend of the men who saved the country. In the last Congress such Democrats as Mr. Springer and Mr. Holman stood ready to vote about $100,000,000 more for pensions than the Republicans would allow to go through, and took occasion to advertise Democratic generosity to the veterans, as compared with the niggardly spirit of the Republicans. This year the Democratic House passes a pension bill some $12,000,000 below Secretary Foster's estimates, and $35,000,000 below Commissioner Raum's; and although this amount is fully as great as that carried in last year's bill, the Republican chorus of accusation at once breaks out, the *Tribune* correspondent telegraphs dreadful things about the "blow at pensions," and the same old farce is renewed. There is this element of tragedy in it, however, that the claim-agents and demagogues play upon partisan fears to send the appropriations higher and higher, so that the country has to carry the burdens of war in a time of profound peace.

It seems likely that there will be continual danger of attempts to tinker our copyright statutes until they have been submitted for revision and codification to a commission of such recognized dignity and authority that respect will be insured for the results of its labors when enacted into law. The sooner such a commission is appointed for this purpose the better, for in few directions is our legislation so far behind that of the rest of the world as in the matter of the protection accorded to literary and artistic property. Meanwhile we hope that Congress will not encourage the latest so-called "amendment" of the Copyright Law, which was presented to both houses of Congress on February 15. This proposes to require each person who takes out a copyright to make a deposit of two copies for the United States, and one copy for each of the States, of every book or other article desired to be protected. This bill (S. 2185; H. R. 5975) was not conceived with any desire to improve the copyright statutes; but, certain property belonging to other people being coveted, it was devised as a scheme by which the desired property could be secured without paying for it. It does not make the matter any better that the books are coveted for State universities or "similar institutions," for these are no more justified in committing robbery through Federal legislation than are private persons. Besides, if it is justifiable to levy a special tax upon the property of authors and artists in order to enrich the libraries of State institutions, it is equally just to tax the property of other classes for the same purpose. The whole conception of such a bill is wrong. There is no justification for taxing an author who is granted a copyright, for the benefit of others; and the demand for copies of his book or other article proposed to be protected must be made upon the sole ground that such deposit is for his benefit, as necessary properly to identify and make secure the right granted to him.

Our contemporary the *Sun* has a learned article on the breach of constitutionalism in Greece, from which it argues the worst consequences to the reigning sovereign of that country. But it has nothing to say about the recent elections in the State of New York or their probable effect upon the ex-Governor and his Presidential prospects. We will accordingly direct the *Sun's* attention to a few leading facts which ought to possess more interest for its readers than the wrongs of Mr. Delyannis, the David B. Hill of Greece. There was an election in Elmira the other day, a regular city election. The chief office to be filled was that of Mayor. The city is the home of David B. Hill. It is a Democratic city. It gave about 1,000 Democratic majority two years ago, and exactly 512 majority for Flower last fall. In the more recent election it gave a majority of 1,284 against the regular Democratic nominee, who was a particular friend of Hill and the brother of his Cornell University friend and admirer, Prof. Collin. If this had been an isolated event, it might have passed for an accident, but, coming in conjunction with a perfect rainstorm of Democratic defeats in this State, it must be taken as a sign that the people are against Mr. Hill and all his works and ways, and that they are all the more against him in proportion as they are nearer to him and better acquainted with him, to wit, at Elmira, in the county of Chemung. This would be interesting matter to the readers of the *Sun*. If our contemporary will excuse us, the misfortunes of the Hillenes are a more engaging subject just now than those of the Hellenes.

Mr. Hill is credited with saying of the town elections in this State that they are of no especial significance, merely showing that there is a "family row" in the Democratic party. We quite agree with him that there has been a "family row" between the party and its rascals, the significance of which he will see later if he does not perceive it now. The latest returns tell the whole story in language too plain to be misunderstood. Elections have been held in forty of the sixty counties of the State. A year ago the Democrats had majorities in the Boards of Supervisors of 12 of these counties, the Republicans had majorities in 23, and in 5 the Boards were evenly divided between the two parties. To-day the Democrats have majorities in the Boards of only 4 counties, the Republicans have majorities in 33, and in 3 the Boards are evenly divided. Out of a total of 352 Supervisors which they had a year ago, the Democrats have lost 99, or 28 per cent. of the whole. The loss of 8 counties out of 12 is a loss of 66 per cent.

We find in the *Cornell Daily Sun* of February 17 a report of an address by "Prof. C. A. Collin of the Law School," before the History and Political Science Associa-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, on the subject of the "Machine in Politics," in which the following passage occurs:

"It is the duty of every true citizen who has any spark of patriotism about him to assist the Machine in one way or another. No one should feel himself above the work of political fighting. *The man who sells his vote for money is more to be respected than the man who stays away from the polls and does not vote.*"

Prof. Collin is the moralist who devotes the greater part of his time to the task of writing eulogies of David B. Hill. His labors in that field are silly and harmless, but when he is allowed by Cornell University to teach its students that the Dave Hill variety of political science is laudable and worthy of their imitation, the matter becomes much more serious. The kind of political science embodied in the passage we have quoted is practised in Tammany Hall, but the teaching of it is a startling innovation in the curriculum of a college.

The unanimous declaration of the Rhode Island Democratic State Convention in favor of Cleveland's nomination grows more significant the more that is learned about the preliminary campaign. The State had been picked out by Hill as a good one in which to work his scheme of getting Hill delegates elected "on the sly" by sharp work in the caucuses; and two or three of the most disreputable "workers" in the party conferred with him as to how they should play the game. But the matter could not be kept quiet. Men like Mayor Honey of Newport and Congressman Lapham warned the people of the plot to cheat them, and stirred up the voters to attend the caucuses and declare their preferences. The result was such an expression of public sentiment in favor of Cleveland everywhere that not a vote was cast in the Convention against the adoption of the strongest Cleveland plank that could be framed. Rhode Island is not exceptional in this respect. The only hope of the Hill men anywhere is in underhand methods. They do not dare to encounter a fair expression of party feeling.

Some remarks of the Rochester *Post-Express* on Dr. Parkhurst's charges against Tammany illustrate admirably the shrewdness of the Tammanyites in getting hold of the Grand Jury lists. The presentment of the Grand Jury signed by two members of the Tammany General Committee, (one of them an ex-keeper of a low dive,) treated the charges made by Dr. Parkhurst against the city authorities in connection with the McGlory case as utterly baseless, and added an amusing comment on the mischief done by "unfounded charges of this character, in creating distrust in the minds of the community with regard to public officials." Accordingly, the country Tammany papers, like the *Post-Express*, make it the text of a homily on the risk the pulpit runs in trusting city newspaper stories about the good men in the City Hall. This furnishes an almost complete explanation of Barney Martin's appointment as Commissioner of Jurors. The fact is that Dr. Parkhurst's charges were absolutely correct, except in the one point of the District Attorney's office having been requested to furnish the evidence against McGlory. And we have little doubt that if the whole truth were known, it would be found that this omission had something to do with the experience of many Grand Juries really anxious to punish criminals who have a "pull," as McGlory had. This experience has shown the danger that when news reaches the District Attorney's office that the Grand Jury is about to pursue a particular malefactor of this class, it will leak out, and the dive-keeper will get warning, and the officer sent after him will come back with the old story—"Impossible to get the evidence." To say this is not necessarily to cast an imputation on the District Attorney himself. But his office is a large office, and a "pull" operates through all sorts of people. The notion that a dive so notorious as McGlory's, and given up to indescribable vileness, could be kept open for a whole year, without the knowledge or connivance of the police or of *anybody* in the District-Attorney's office, is a little too ridiculous for belief. In fact, the November Grand Jury proved its absurdity by sending two of their own number to get the proof, after the captain of the precinct had impudently denied the proof, and they got it without the smallest difficulty. There is always a touch of *bouffe* about Tammany doings, and it was not wanting in the present instance. Has Offenbach anything more comic than an old dive-keeper's signing a "presentment" rebuking a clergyman for saying that a brother dive-keeper could have been found out and punished earlier if the officers of the law had done their duty, and warning him of the danger of "impeaching the integrity of public officials"!

Secretary Foster is credited with saying in London that he has been asked many questions about the alleged system of sending convicts to this country from Great Britain, and with having made the following explanation:

"The question in Parliament in regard to the matter, and the comments of the papers, were based on a misapprehension that the whole Commission was responsible for the report. When I appointed the Commission, I deemed it right to select among the five Commissioners one direct representative of the labor interest. That was Mr. Powderly; and I do not find fault with his report. But that story about ex-convicts had its origin in Mr. Schulteis's report. People on the other side will treat the story on its merits. Here the mistake is made by taking the statement as supported by the whole Commission."

Mr. Foster appears to know very little about the official reports which are made to him and by him given to the public, if that explanation is authentic. The convict charge was not made by Schulteis, but by his fellow-commissioner, Judson N. Cross, and, as printed in the *Tribune* of February 8, was that he had "positive proof that from England, Ireland, and Scotland during the last eleven years there has been a systematic, widespread, and thoroughly organized movement, known, encouraged, and patronized by the Government of Great Britain, for the purpose of sending convicts and ex-convicts to the United States," and that "the passage and money to keep them while seeking employment here is furnished directly by the Government of Great Britain." Mr. Cross sustained this charge with details of the system, saying that the sum paid by the British Government to each convict sent was six pounds. Both Cross and Schulteis, as well as Powderly, were Mr. Foster's appointees, and he has made their work his by adopting and publishing it. His attempt to escape all responsibility by putting it on Schulteis, and then repudiating Schulteis, is a pretty small performance.

Free evening schools were established in New Haven about thirty years ago, and have been maintained ever since, but for several winters past the attendance upon those conducted for English-speaking pupils has been steadily diminishing. It might be supposed that this indicated less desire to overcome the defects of early education among the immigrants, who have always comprised the larger part of the pupils, than was the case in the sixties; but the *Palladium*, which appears to have investigated the matter, says that the truth is that there is much less occasion for such schools now than there was a score of years ago. It says that young Irish immigrants now are usually able to read with ease and to write fairly well, and have a fair knowledge of the rudiments of arithmetic, and it seems doubtful whether it will long be necessary to maintain free evening schools for English-speaking pupils. There has been a good attendance the past winter at the evening schools maintained for Italians, Scandinavians, and Russian Jews, but the principal object of the pupils has been to learn the English language. Our Swedish and Norwegian immigrants are usually well educated when they arrive here, and the *Palladium* says that, so far as New Haven's experience goes, "the Italians are fairly well educated, and the Russians and Poles, while giving evidence of having had few or almost no advantages in this direction, show a brightness and industry which make their progress rapid." This is a very encouraging report, and deserves attention at a time when there is so much anxiety about the ignorance of our immigrants.

Gov. McKinley issued an appeal the other day for subscriptions for the starving Russians. Why did he not issue one at the same time for the starving Austrians? Surely, if either of these classes of sufferers has a claim on him, it is the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

latter. The Russians were smitten by the hand of Providence, the Austrians by that of McKinley. By putting a duty of 1,400 per cent. on pearl buttons, McKinley and his followers inflicted cruel misery on thousands of their fellow-creatures. Moreover, this is what they intended to do, and what their newspapers have been bragging about since; as though it were a creditable thing for them to bring about the same suffering that has been caused in a neighboring country by a drought and a bad harvest. We submit that it is incumbent on McKinley to call for subscriptions for the poor of Austria as well as those of Russia.

We hope that those physicians who are sticklers for the fine points of medical ethics have not failed to notice the harm done their profession by some of the expert medical testimony in the attempt to determine the sanity of E. M. Field. The extraordinary fact was brought out that one expert of high standing had at first given it as his written opinion that the man was insane—for which opinion, based though it was mostly upon the representations of others, he had been paid $250, and then had come into court to testify that he thought Field sane. Now, there was no particular discredit in his having changed his mind, except as it showed him to have been hasty and careless in reaching his first decision, but does not every one see how his taking an exorbitant fee for a medical service, simply because it was to have a legal effect, and then being compelled to admit that the service was really worth nothing whatever, brings the profession into disrepute? Such things would not be of so frequent occurrence did the medical associations make a rule, as they should, that only an ordinary charge should be made for expert testimony in legal trials. If a physician were to get for his time in court no more than he would get for the same time passed in his office or making his rounds, the ground for the increasing popular cynicism in regard to the honesty of medical experts would be cut away. Medical ethics is mostly confined to such questions as that of a doctor's advertising himself, or that of his committing the great crime of helping save life in company with a physician of another "school"; we think its sphere might profitably be extended so as to cover some of the evils of the system of expert testimony.

It appears that Lord Salisbury does not agree to a renewal of the *modus vivendi* for the present sealing season, or that he consents only to the drawing of a line thirty miles from the shore, within which sealing shall be prohibited while the arbitration is going on. Nobody has attempted to show that Lord Salisbury is under any obligation, express or implied, to renew the *modus vivendi*, even as to thirty miles from the shore. The main point in dispute is whether we have exclusive jurisdiction outside of the three-mile limit. That and some other things are referred to arbitration. Now our newspaper men insist that, while this arbitration is going on, Great Britain shall yield something else. The *Tribune* begins an article in this way—an article which will make its London correspondent writhe in torment when he sees it:

"President Harrison may rest assured that the people will heartily sustain him in any measure he may find it necessary to take for the maintenance of the rights of the United States in the seal fisheries. The question has ceased to be one of dollars and cents. The British Government has chosen to treat it in a manner altogether indefensible and unfair. The elaborate and painstaking tardiness of Lord Salisbury appears to Americans deliberately intended to give Canadian *poachers* abundant opportunity to *plunder* and *pilfer* to their heart's content. If that is not his intention, he has a really wonderful faculty of *acting, with friendly purpose, precisely as an enemy would act.*"

Poachers, plunder, and pilfer are handy words to stir up strife with. Bear in mind that the very question referred to arbitration is whether the taking of seals beyond the three-mile limit is poaching, plundering, and pilfering, or not. By referring it to arbitration we have allowed that it is doubtful. But if the peace of the world can be endangered till next November by using catchwords and making thoughtless people believe that the thing referred to arbitration is not doubtful, then let us take the risk.

The overwhelming victory of the "Progressives" — that is, of the Liberals—at the election of the London County Council, owes a good deal of its importance to the indication it offers that the majority of the London districts, which return sixty-two members to the House of Commons, will be carried by the Liberals at the approaching general election. Of the sixty-two, forty-nine are now in the hands of the Tories; it seems to be generally conceded that the proportion will be reversed at the next election, for the "Progressives" are nearly all Liberals. Their programme includes a great number of schemes, some of which are distinctly socialistic in their tendency. The most prominent is an attack on the great landlords of the West End, of whom the chief are the Dukes of Westminster and Devonshire and Norfolk, who have grown enormously rich through the famous "unearned increment"—that is, by sitting still and letting the city spread over their property. They sell no land, but simply lease it for building purposes, and thus escape the local taxation. There has been much agitation of late years for legislation compelling them to sell the fee, or at all events curtailing their leasing power, but the opposition in the present Parliament has been too strong. Dukes have great weight under the present Ministry. The new County Council will be overwhelmingly hostile to them, however, and will undoubtedly at least saddle them with a fair share of the rates which are now borne by the lessees or occupiers of the houses But it must be said for the great land lords that whatever beauty the West End of the city possesses has been due to them Hardly any of the great squares would exist to-day but for their forethought and enterprise in laying out their property and controlling the class of houses erected on it. But the "unearned increment" makes the mouth of the democracy water, and it is a most appetizing spectacle.

The London *Economist's* annual review for 1891 tells us what has become of Mr. Goschen's proposed financial reforms. These, it may be recalled, consisted of a proposed issue of £1 notes by the Bank of England, against four-fifths gold and one-fifth securities, and an authorization to *over-issue* notes in times of crisis on condition of paying the Government a high rate of interest on such over-issue. The *Economist* tells us that,

"owing to the antagonism of bankers and the obstructive attitude of the Gladstonian party, there is no probability of its passing through Parliament. The only legislation that there is any chance of carrying through is a tentative measure, merely authorizing the Bank to issue £1 notes on the same conditions as it now issues notes of a larger denomination, and to confer upon it power to increase its fiduciary issues in the manner proposed by Mr. Goschen, but without any restriction as to the amount of gold it must hold before it can begin to exercise that power. That would leave many currency questions unsettled, and would also leave undetermined the question as to how the banks are to be induced or compelled to keep adequate cash reserves."

The *Economist* notes the fact that the joint-stock banks have voluntarily increased their reserves since Mr. Goschen made his speech at Leeds one year ago. Their proportion of reserve to liability in December, 1890, was 12.9 per cent. average. In December, 1891, it was 13.7 per cent. This is not a large gain, but it is something. It amounts in the aggregate to about two and a half million dollars. Probably the fear that has pervaded the money market since the Baring crisis has been quite as effectual in causing this increase of reserve as Mr. Goschen's speeches.

Even more striking than Emperor William's words is his action in having prosecuted for lese-majesty the half-a-dozen German newspapers that have expressed a mild disapproval of his recent absolutist speech. In that he advised those who did not endorse his policy to leave the country; he now seems to propose to give them the further alternative of imprisonment. It is not enough for a genuine reactionary to have his way: he must have it without a whisper of opposition, without a suspicion being anywhere intimated that his way is not the divinely ordained way. One of the half-crazy Spanish Bourbons once ordered pen, ink, and paper to be taken from his room. "How can I sleep with such deadly weapons near my bed?" he asked. In his nervous dread of discussion of any kind, William is showing himself a Bourbon of the Bourbons.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"GETTING THE DELEGATES."

ONE point has been made against the anti-Hill Democrats in this State which has a good deal of force in it, namely, that they witnessed unmoved Hill's cheating at the elections, and rose against him only when he called the Convention too early. We trust that now, in view of the way in which the voters are expressing their opinions about him at the county elections, his opponents here will be able to summon up courage to attack him, not simply as a man who calls conventions too early, but as a notorious trickster and corruptionist. For it is now being made manifest to the least perspicacious eye that the strategy which consists in "getting the delegates" and letting the other party get the offices, is an exceedingly unprofitable one, even when backed up by the authority of so accomplished a manager as Hill. Hill is plainly under the illusion in this matter into which nearly all our working politicians of his mental calibre fall. The early training of nearly all such men in politics consists in learning how "to get the delegates." Our nominating system is now so cumbrous and complicated that only trained professionals can work it successfully. Accordingly, everybody of the Hill type who wants to rise, devotes himself diligently to the art of "fixing caucuses" and primaries, so as to control or influence the composition of the nominating convention. In order to accomplish this he has to construct a machine, which is often a marvel of patient industry and ingenuity. When it is constructed, and gets to work, and turns out delegates of a satisfactory type, the inventor is naturally very much elated, and flatters himself that he has done all that needs to be done in politics in order to become a statesman. When Hill said, with a chuckle, that "the other fellows had got the mass-meetings and the brass bands, but he was getting the delegates," he evidently thought, in common with all his class, that the organization of the nominating conventions was the politician's final cause; and when Springer treated the "regularity" of Hill's delegation as ending all controversy as to who was New York's "favorite son," he expressed the same idea.

Hardly any of these men look beyond the convention to the elections, because preparation for the election involves the cultivation of the art of persuasion. It means the preparation of arguments addressed to the country at large touching the policy of the party and the character of the candidates. This art of persuasion they relegate now to a very subordinate place indeed. To the work to be done after the nominations, by way of carrying the elections, they, in fact, give hardly any consideration at all. If they get their man nominated, they trust to luck for the rest.

We are now describing exactly what has happened in nearly every Democratic canvass since the war. When McClellan and Seymour and Hancock were nominated, it was as plain as a pike-staff that no thought whatever had been bestowed on the arguments by which the voters were to be induced to elect them. The strength of the managers had all been expended in "getting the delegates" and "carrying the convention," so that there was no foresight or energy left for shaping a party policy or for commending it to the electors. When Mr. Cleveland got into the Presidency, and furnished the party with a policy — that is, with something to present to the country, after the nomination, in the nature of a programme—the managers were actually, as we now see, disgusted with the man; and when he showed no capacity for "getting the delegates," they set to work, might and main, to get rid of him, and substitute for him a trickster of the Hill type, who knows how to "get the delegates," although he knows nothing else.

When Hill "got the delegates" at the last election, the whole Democratic party in this State seemed awestruck. There was dead silence, even among respectable men, for a month after Flower's election. When it was broken, we heard nothing but glorification of the mighty man who had carried so many State elections, and was now going to send a solid delegation to Chicago to vote for himself. What Hill was to say, after getting there, or what anybody else was to say for him to the people of the United States, by way of proving his fitness for the Presidency, nobody seems to have considered for one moment. In fact, we verily believe that if he had not committed the professional blunder of calling the Convention in midwinter, he might have "got the delegates" in April just as readily as in February, and would have entered the Convention as a sort of Democratic Messiah, instead of as an exposed charlatan, and he might have secured the nomination, either for himself or some other "low rascal," on the pretence that he could carry New York for the Democratic candidate. The horror now expressed in some quarters about sending out a contesting delegation, because it "wouldn't be regular, don't you know?" shows how deep-seated the feeling is that greater skill and merit are shown in controlling Presidential conventions than in winning Presidential elections. We do not believe that to-day one respectable man among Hill's supporters has ever considered what he could say for Hill on the stump in case he were nominated, to voters in Illinois or Ohio or Iowa or Wisconsin, who would not be influenced by his smartness in "getting the delegates" in New York. They would actually be unable to offer a single other reason for electing him. His views on public questions nobody, not even himself, knows. His history as Governor is one long record of jobbery and intrigue. He is neither eloquent nor "magnetic," and his bodily presence is more or less repulsive. His associates and friends at home are mainly of the disreputable class, but he knows how to "get the delegates"!

His excesses as a cheat have, however, at last apparently waked his party up in this State to the fact that the final cause of a party organization is not to illustrate smartness, but to win elections, just as the final cause of a locomotive is not to carry people up and down the line as a display of curious mechanical ingenuity, but to carry people to their destination. A precious possession for the party Hill would be after a defeat deliberately risked on his account. To what use could he be turned? Who would take him off the party's hands, even for the humblest kind of farm work?

HILL'S RECORD REVISED.

WE sent recently a copy of the *Evening Post's* pamphlet on Hill's political record to a supporter of his, one of the few respectable Democrats whom he has been able to attract to his cause, with a request that he inform us whether "all this is true or not." After a brief delay the pamphlet has come back to us with annotations of various kinds marked in the margin against some of the more serious of the charges. As these annotations comprise the first and only defence of Hill that we have been able to get from any quarter, we shall review and answer them in their order, so far as they are of sufficient moment to call for consideration.

The first chapter, describing Hill's early political career in Elmira, is very slightly annotated, the critic confining himself almost entirely to underscoring sentences containing such charges against Hill as that he never mingled in respectable society, never hesitated to sell out his own party, bought votes with *crisp* bank bills, and that he raised the price of votes in Elmira till $20 was paid for a vote for Governor. All these charges we are prepared to prove, even to the fact that the bank bills were "crisp," for they were obtained direct from the bank in large quantities for this especial use. The critic asks for the names of "two responsible citizens" whom we cited as eye-witnesses of Hill's personal purchase of votes. We have them for him, or for anybody else who forces us to the proof of our statements. He underscores the assertion that "scores of lawyers and business men" will attest the fact of Hill's purchase of votes, as if the number were too great. It is the literal truth, and we can so prove it. These are fair samples of all the criticisms upon the first chapter.

In regard to the aqueduct scandal, the commentator has done a great public service in raising questions which will enable us to go more fully than the pamphlet into the details of that part of Hill's public record. His first annotation is as to our statement that Squire was "thrust into the office" of Commissioner of Public Works. In the margin he asks: "By Hill?" Certainly not. The charge is not that Hill put Squire into office, but that he formed an alliance with him after he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

got in, knowing well that Squire was a rascal. The commentator then underscores the words "thick and thin" as applied to this alliance. A citation from Squire's testimony, given under oath on April 22, 1888, will show the strict truth of this definition. Squire testified that at Hill's request he called upon him at the Hoffman House in the fall of 1885, and that Hill requested his support in the approaching campaign; that he, Squire, then told Hill that Mayor Grace was trying to get him out of office on the ground that he was unfit, and that Hill replied to the effect that "I (Squire) need give myself no anxiety; that if I did not get convicted in a criminal court in matters connected with my department, where he couldn't stand by me, I might be certain that I should find him behind me; I told him that was very pleasant for me to hear, and I said: 'Governor, if there is anything in the Department of Public Works that I can properly and in order put at your service, let me know.'"

Squire went on to testify that at the same interview Hill arranged for his friend and former law partner, William L. Muller, to be the confidential agent between the two for the distribution of patronage and other favors. In support of these statements Squire produced letters to himself from the Governor written in February, June, July, September, and November, 1885, and as late as May, 1886, all couched in the most friendly terms, all addressed to the "Hon. Rollin M. Squire." The pamphlet annotator puts opposite the statement that he addressed Squire as "My dear sir," the exclamation, "Very bad!" Another Hillite, the *World*, said of these letters from Hill to Squire, when they were first published in April, 1888: "The worst that can be said of any of them is that the Governor of the Empire State should be in larger business than securing offices for his friends from such a man as Squire."

The annotator's next objection is to the statement that Hill knew of the existence of Squire's incriminating letter to Flynn before he joined with the Republicans of the Legislature in the passage of the "deal" Aqueduct Commission Bill. He implies that Hill's denial, which is also cited in the pamphlet, disposes of this charge. It does not, for the reason that the denial was a falsehood. Two witnesses swore that they had informed the Governor of the existence of this letter before the "deal" bill became a law and before the letter itself was published in August, 1886. William M. Ivins testified that he showed the Governor a copy of the letter in March, 1886; Squire testified that he informed the Governor of the fact of its existence in the Hoffman House interview. It is known, also, that the original of the letter was shown to the Governor just before he signed the bill. Yet, when the original was published, and Hill was forced by the publication to remove Squire from office, he made and published the following denial of a charge that he had seen it before its publication:

> "The statement is unqualifiedly false. I saw a copy of the letter in question for the first time when it was printed in the newspapers. I have never seen the original letter."

The annotator's next question is the following in reference to the charge that Hill's personal campaign notes for $10,000 and $5,000 were paid out of the profits made on an aqueduct contract which was awarded to O'Brien & Clark, whose bid was $54,000 above the lowest: "Were they not paid by a subscription list?"

On the first day of the investigation Thomas M. Robinson, Cashier of the Mount Morris Bank, testified that he remembered a note for $10,000 which was presented at the bank by William L. Muller. The note was presented, not for discount, but for sale. *It was signed by Gov. Hill*, and endorsed by John O'Brien and Heman Clark as individuals. Heman Clark testified on April 23 that O'Brien came to him in the campaign of 1885 and said he wished to raise $10,000 for Gov. Hill; that a note for that amount was drawn and signed by Gov. Hill and endorsed by Muller first, O'Brien second, and Clark third; that when it matured it was paid by another note signed by O'Brien and endorsed by Maurice B. Flynn; it was finally paid by O'Brien, and the money was charged to O'Brien's account on the books of the firm of Clark & O'Brien.

The Governor, in a statement which he gave out for publication on April 11, 1888, admitted the main facts in the case by saying that he signed the two notes in conjunction with Muller and O'Brien, and that after election the notes were "taken up and paid by contributions of friends and various Democrats, including Chairman O'Brien, who was the largest contributor." Alton B. Parker, who was one of the endorsers of the $5,000 note, testified that it was cashed by John Keenan, who was a member of the Democratic State Committee; that the cash was paid to him on Thursday before election. John O'Brien, Chairman of the Democratic State Committee, testified that he contributed $500 to take up this note; that Alton B. Parker, who in the meantime had been appointed by Hill a judge of the Supreme Court, contributed $500, and the balance was made up elsewhere; that it ran along for two or three months after that, and finally Muller came to him and he (O'Brien) endorsed Muller's personal note for $5,200 and raised the money in Rhinebeck, which was sent to Keenan to pay off the original note.

As to the awarding of the aqueduct contract at a clear profit of $30,000 to O'Brien & Clark, the annotator asks if the pamphlet is not in error in saying it was awarded by the reorganized commission. It is. The award was made by the old commission in compliance with the personal request of the Governor, through Muller, to members of the commission. Mayor Grace testified that he was asked to favor the award in order that the Governor's notes might be paid; he was positive that the amount of those notes was represented to him as $30,000. Comptroller Loew testified that he was requested to favor the award because the Governor wished it to be made.

In regard to the chapter on the theft of the Legislature, the annotator's first point is that Judge Ingraham's stay was a justification for the conduct of Emans in going to Albany to get back from the mails the legal Dutchess County returns. Judge Cullen has disposed of that by deciding that Emans had closed his official duty as to the returns when he put them in the mails, and that any interference with them by him after that was a "personal crime," not official misconduct. The annotator's next point is that Judge Ingraham's stay was in some way an excuse for the abstraction of the legal returns from the mails after their arrival. But the stay was issued after the returns had been mailed. If the stay were binding, why commit the theft? Judge Cullen's decision on this point is conclusive:

> "The [legal] returns were not before the Board of State Canvassers, not because of any defect in the transmission, nor of a disobedience of the order of the Court, but because, by the action of the Secretary of State, the Governor, and the counsel of the Comptroller, the *returns were taken from the several public offices where they had been properly received* and were given to Mr. Emans."

SILVER POLITICS.

THE authentic announcement has been made that Secretary Foster's journey to England has nothing to do with an international monetary conference, or with any public business. He has gone abroad for the sake of his health and for no other reason. All expectation that the nations of Europe will get themselves into a *financial* scrape in order to help us out of a *political* scrape, may therefore be abandoned. All those countries, except Austria and Russia, now have the single gold standard, and Austria is going that way with absolute certainty and as fast as possible. India would go the same way if she could, but she is too poor. The change of standard would involve the demonetization of such a prodigious stock of silver, coined and uncoined, that the task seems hopeless. As there is no legal ratio between gold and silver in India, the Government would naturally begin with the existing market value, and would decree that the gold rupee should be in law whatever it was worth in the market on the day the change was made. What to do afterwards with the silver accumulations of ages would be the perplexing question.

We have spoken of our silver mêlée as political rather than financial. This is exactly what it is, and the Europeans are not so dull that they cannot see its true complexion. The bad education our people have received during the past quarter of a century, beginning with the first legal-tender act and followed by the legal-tender decisions and by new legal-tender laws

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and by the Silver-Purchase Act of 1878, is now yielding its natural fruit. The ideas of multitudes of people are turned topsy-turvy. The notion has got abroad that it is the duty of Government to furnish money to the people, and that the buying of silver is the furnishing of money to the people. It requires no great step to reach the conclusion that free coinage would give everybody all the money, and, therefore, all the good things of this life, that he wants. The Congressmen who know better (and there are very few who do not know better) are caught in this net, which is partly of their own and partly of their predecessors' weaving. How to get through the session without making matters worse than they are now, and yet so as to satisfy the misguided people at home that they have done all they could for free coinage, is the problem up for solution in Washington. It is this which makes the puzzle a political rather than a financial one. It is not confined to either party, although for the moment it is rather more embarrassing to the Democrats than to the Republicans. If the Republicans, however, should begin to toy with the silver question in order to see how nearly they could come to free coinage and still miss it, with the view of "putting the Democrats in a hole," as the saying is, they would find themselves in a position of much peril. The mischief is too great for any party to gain an advantage by playing games with it. "The Democrats have done all the threatening and the Republicans all the damage," said Mr. Williams of Massachusetts, the other day. That is true, and because it is true the Republicans cannot afford to take any doubtful position in the House when the fight comes on.

The damage done by the Republicans was begun when they passed the Bland-Allison Law of 1878. It was increased when they passed the law of 1890. Whatever overt acts have been committed up to the present time they are responsible for; and if it be true, as many skilled financiers believe, that the present exportation of gold is due to an apprehension that we are near to the silver basis, the Republicans are responsible for that also, for they passed the laws which caused this apprehension to exist. They raised the silver purchases from two millions to four and a half millions per month. They weakened the power of the Treasury to cope with this new evil by cutting down the revenues and increasing the expenditures of the Government. All the perils from silver that confront us at this moment are of their devising. If a premium on gold should be disclosed in the market to-morrow, the Republican party would be answerable for it. Whenever such a premium is disclosed (under present laws), that party will have to answer for it.

The avoiding of a gold premium is a problem of several unknown quantities. One of these is the state of the public mind both here and abroad touching the permanence of the gold standard. Every dollar of gold in this country belongs to somebody who is on the *qui vive* to take care of it and see that it does not depreciate on his hands. The Treasury gold is no exception, since that belongs to the holders of greenbacks, or (since the law of 1890) to the holders of any Government paper; in other words, it belongs to the first comers. Now there is nothing so well calculated to create a panic as any signs that the Republicans are weakening their opposition to free coinage. The public cannot know whether such signs are a manœuvre for position in the political campaign, or whether they betoken a real purpose to pass a free-coinage bill. The public may not wait to inquire. They may say: "We will take our gold now, and let them finish their manœuvres at their leisure." For these reasons any attempt on the part of over-cunning Republicans to toy with this question is full of peril.

CLERGYMEN AND THE RICH.

THAT the voluntary system of church support inevitably makes the relations of a clergyman to his richer parishioners exceedingly delicate, no one will deny. Newman put the case as follows in the first of the "Tracts for the Times":

> "We know how miserable is the state of religious bodies not supported by the State. Look at the Dissenters on all sides of you, and you will see at once that their Ministers, depending simply upon the people, become the *creatures* of the people. Are you content that this should be your case? . . . Can we allow ourselves to preach smooth things and prophesy deceits? to make the way of life easy to the rich and indolent, and to bribe the humbler classes by excitements and strong intoxicating doctrine?"

There was a certain amount of rhetorical exaggeration about this. The servility of the Dissenter and the noble independence of the Churchman were neither of them as extreme as Newman would have had his readers think. But there was a core of substantial truth in what he wrote, so far as it relates to the tendency of the voluntary system; and it is a truth which has but gained in force and pertinence with the lapse of time. Since those days wealth has increased tremendously, and the owner of a large fortune has come to have, by that fact alone, a social and political importance vastly greater. Moreover, the main bulwark of the clergyman's position, behind which he could then securely stand and resent the tacit or overt aggressions of the rich pew-holder, has been almost obliterated. This was, the powerful tradition which marked him off as distinctively the educated man of the community, and the reverence for his office which had been inherited from former times. But as the prestige of wealth, as such, has increased, the prestige of the clerical profession, as such, has declined. With less than ever before to rely upon in indifference to the jingle of the guinea, with the standard of "success" and "acceptability" as a minister coming more and more to be identified with the amount of pew-rents, it is not strange that the bearing of a clergyman towards the rich should have come to be one of the severest tests of his character.

That many of the ministry fail miserably under it is clear enough. It is not often that they are so openly made tools of as they were in the early floating of the Northern Pacific Railroad's bonds, nor can we suppose that such unblushing worship of the golden calf as was indulged in a few nights ago by a company of Presbyterian ministers at the house of Jay Gould is a matter of common occurrence; but in less conspicuous and offensive ways the subservience of some among the clergy to men of wealth is as indisputable as it is unfortunate. We are perfectly aware that this subservience is frequently unconscious. A minister will go on accepting great personal favors from rich men, and according them a deference beyond the deserts of their character or attainments, without seeing how, on the one hand, he is degrading himself to the position of their steward, or, on the other, is for ever shutting his mouth against their shortcomings. And we know, too, how commendable, or apparently so, are the motives which often lead clergymen to honor the rich above other men. They sometimes do it in resentment of a false idea that the millionaire may not be a man for a' that. They are aware, as the public is not, of the immense amount of good done in an unassuming way by men who make their wealth a servant, not a master. Then they often say that it is idle to deny the fact that money wields an enormous power in the world, and that they are not to be blamed for trying to turn that power to the worthiest uses. They have a comfortable sense of being on an easy footing with men who wield the greatest forces of modern society, and easily transmute that feeling into an assurance that the Church and the cause of religion are made so much the stronger thereby.

We have not the slightest disposition to make out ministers sinners above all other men in this particular. In this they but share the tendencies of their time. If we were to be strict to mark iniquity in this matter, what college president would stand? The late J. G. Holland had in one of his stories a vulgar man of great but dubiously acquired wealth, who was long hunted and harried by searchers after educational endowments. The fellow took it all as a part of the mammon-worship he was accustomed to, but finally aspired to higher things, and confided to a friend that he was fairly pining for a theological seminary to endow. The satire is too close to the truth to be pleasant for some institutions. But the state of things satirized is to be found in no one class in the community: we are all in danger of giving in to the blind worship of wealth.

But while we cheerfully admit this to be true, we still maintain that the clergyman ought to be more jealous than other men of anything that would put him into com-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

promising relations with the rich, because he is almost the only man in the modern world who can make an effective protest against the vulgarization of society and the demoralization of character which come from making wealth the sole and sufficient standard. He is about the only man who can, if he will, attack the excessive claims of riches, in things social, political, and religious, without falling under suspicion of insincerity. When the Anarchist raves against great accumulations of money in one man's hands, it is commonly understood that he wants his share of the plunder. Certainly, the average newspaper editor, with his pen controlled in the counting-room, cannot pose as a lofty moralist on the subject. Those writers who are not thus hampered, and who, in a daily paper or magazine article or essay, can freely speak their minds, must yet rest under a certain suspicion that their contempt for wealth is only provisional, and subject to revision if they get on in the world.

But the minister of religion has, or should have, by virtue of his office, renounced getting on in the world. His is the only profession which expressly rules out great pecuniary gains. Its ideal is a service of humanity, with only an incidental livelihood as a material reward. A man in that profession, if he is circumspect, can speak to the most vital needs of modern society as no one else can. Personally beyond suspicion of crooking the hinges of the knee, in a place of teaching made reverend and authoritative by long tradition, it is in his power, as it is in that of no other mortal, to expose and combat and defeat the evils of a society rapidly becoming plutocratic. People talk of the decayed power of the pulpit, but here is its unrivalled opportunity. Not that it is to "reconcile the interests of capital and labor"—may a kind Heaven spare us further sermons on that subject—but let it, by precept and example, exalt manliness and simple virtue above great possessions; let it insist that vulgarity and folly remain vulgarity and folly though tricked out in diamonds; let it apply the Scripture rule of taking gifts for religious purposes only when the giver shall have first expressed his willingness to restore fourfold if he has wronged any man. It is because we thus appreciate the immense usefulness within the grasp of the ministry of to-day that we deplore the way so many of its members are throwing it away by approving where they should rebuke, by going with the crowd, and, worst of all, by making themselves, in Newman's phrase, the creatures of the very men whom it is their business to instruct in righteousness.

MR. BALFOUR'S FAILURE.

THE most striking event in foreign politics during the past month has been the collapse of the constructive policy of the Tories in dealing with the Irish question. There have been six years of coercion in Ireland, attended, they say, with complete success in restoring order, but this confession has been unfortunate, as it forced them to attempt constructive remedial measures in the last days of the present Parliament, after they have lost ground a good deal with the constituencies in England. Accordingly, Mr. Balfour, as soon as the present session opened and he had assumed the leadership of the House on Mr. W. H. Smith's death, brought in a bill for the establishment of county councils in Ireland—that is, for the government of Irish counties by popular representative bodies. Irish counties are now governed in the main by grand juries composed of the local gentry and selected by the High Sheriff. There is no question that, during the last half-century at least, this grand-jury government has been on the whole both pure and efficient. There is no likelihood that an elective council would give the taxpayers better results for less money. The great objection to it is, that it is the government of a class separated in feelings, traditions, and opinions from the main body of the population, and that as long as it exists, therefore, the Irish cannot get even rudimentary lessons in the art of self-government. It is, in fact, the want of the political training at home which makes the Irish peasantry such an undesirable political element when they emigrate to countries in which they enjoy a full share in the management of local affairs. Moreover, the more they emigrate, the greater the discontent of those who remain behind, over their exclusion from all share in local administration. So that, in introducing his "Irish Local Government Bill," Mr. Balfour's object was not to give the Irish better local government so much as local government that would be more satisfactory to the people, and tend to abate the agitation for an Irish Parliament.

The occasion was a very critical one in Mr. Balfour's career, for probably nobody knows better than himself by this time how hollow is the greatness which his career as Irish Secretary during the past three years has thrust upon him. What has given him his great fame as the rising hope of the Tories and the idol of London society, is his sudden development of very remarkable debating talent, after sixteen years of obscurity in the House of Commons, and the cool and jaunty way in which he enforced the Irish Coercion Act and bore the Irish taunts and insults which had broken down Mr. Forster and Sir George Trevelyan. In fact, it may be said that it was the latter which really made his political future, in conjunction with his relationship to Lord Salisbury. But in enforcing the Irish Coercion Act he showed no qualities which may not be found in great abundance among the young men of the upper class in England. He belongs, in fact, to a very common aristocratic type, which once played a great part in politics, but is now mainly represented in the army, viz., the cool, plucky, unsentimental, fastidious man, animated with considerable contempt for Celts and colored people, and enjoying immensely the sharp, short methods of military government. The government which was put in Mr. Balfour's hands by the Irish Coercion Act was essentially military; and by a vigorous use of it—that is, by locking up the orators and hunting down the turbulent with soldiers (for the Irish police are soldiers), and following the suspected, in the old Austrian fashion, with spies—he produced in the course of a few years an appearance of external tranquillity. His praises in his own set were then sung as loudly as if there were not a thousand officers of the British Army who could have done the work as well, and as if Cavour had never said, "Anybody can govern with 'a state of siege.'"

Moreover—and this is the most curious thing in his career—his friends have talked as if the chief object of his Irish administration was to reveal his debating talents and his courage, and as if, this being accomplished, his success or failure in really pacifying Ireland by reconciling people to the English connection was an entirely secondary matter. So that it has been a not uncommon experience, in talking with his admirers about him, to be told that, although it was quite true that the Irish were no more reconciled to English rule now than when he began, nevertheless every one now recognizes the force that lay under his dilettante exterior, and the marvellous ability with which he met the Irish and the Gladstonians in debate, and, therefore, he must be considered a prodigious success and the coming Tory leader.

The probabilities are, however, that he was not himself deceived, except in the first year or two, by this absurd flattery, and knew that the time must come when he would have to give better proof of statesmanship than clapping the Irish into jail. The time has come, and he has produced his first really constructive and healing measure, the first measure which was to offer the Irish a real share in the government of their own country. The necessity was the greater because his great charity measure—the vote of $150,000,000 to be lent to the tenants to enable them to buy their holdings from the landlords—has proved a failure thus far. Mr. Jackson, his successor in the Irish Secretaryship, had to admit this in the opening debate on "the address." Of the $150,000,000, only about $1,000,000 has been called for by either landlords or tenants.

The scene in the House of Commons when Mr. Balfour introduced the Local-Government Bill is reported to have been very extraordinary. His exposition of its contents was very spiritless, because it is known to receive only half-hearted approval from his own party. By the Liberals and the Irish it was received with shouts of laughter, which followed him to the end. What called forth the most up-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

roarious mirth, and furnished the weapon which will probably have most to do with killing the measure, is his plan for preventing the county councils from misbehaving. He said, as reported in the London *Times*:

"Under the bill, application may be made by twenty cess-payers to a judge of assize for leave to petition for the removal of councillors of counties or baronies [loud Opposition ironical cheers and laughter] on the ground that the council has been guilty of persistent disobedience of the law [renewed laughter], or of corruption [renewed laughter], or of malversation or of oppression [loud laughter]."

The debate after this was a scene of great merriment. The places of the councillors "found guilty" by the judges were to be filled by appointment of the Lord-Lieutenant. But the mirth reached its height when Mr. Chamberlain, who had been dubbed by Sir William Harcourt the secret "mother of the bill," rose to defend this plan of having legislators tried for bad legislation by two judges and punished by the loss of their seats. The distrust of the constituencies displayed in it was not less comical than the assumption that the judgments of the two judges on the character of their measures would be received by the voters with reverence and acquiescence. As a feature of local self-government, it was of course a delightful Irish bull, but it had to be put in to satisfy the Tory distrust of the Irish capacity for self-government, and that curious Tory expectation that the Irish would acknowledge, themselves, that this distrust was justifiable. So when Mr. Chamberlain asked the Liberals what they were laughing at, and said the Supreme Court of the United States exercised just the same supervision over the State Legislatures, the joke assumed monstrous proportions. Said he:

"As I understand, the main safeguard, and the one spoken of by honorable members below the gangway as an insult to Ireland, is a safeguard which the Americans, the most democratic and independent people on the face of the world, have actually introduced into their Constitution. [Hear, hear.] At the present time there is not in the United States of America a Legislature in any of these governing States which cannot, in the words of the right hon. gentleman—the absurd, the theatrical words of the member for Newcastle—be put into the dock and tried and judged by a judicial tribunal.

"Mr. J. Morley—And suppressed?

"Mr. J. Chamberlain—No, not suppressed. My right honorable friend will not get off in that way. I am coming to suppression directly. The charge of the right honorable gentleman against the Government was that they were going to put county councils in the dock. No matter what the penalty was to be if convicted, the insult was that they were going to put them in the dock. [Cheers.] I say, in exactly the same way as these councils would be put into the dock, the Legislature of every State in the United States of America may be brought before the Supreme Court and 'put into the dock' and their acts declared to be *ultra vires*."

This brought Mr. Bryce to his feet, and there followed this curious colloquy:

"I should like to know what any ordinary American would have said to the right honorable gentleman's argument if he had had the good fortune to be sitting in the strangers' gallery. [Loud cheers.] That American would have realized that there was no country where American institutions were so little understood as the country from which so many of them were derived. [Cheers.] The right honorable gentleman stated that there was no Legislature in the United States which might not be put into the dock and tried by a tribunal in exactly the same way as it was proposed to treat the Irish county councils.

"Mr. J. Chamberlain—I did not say that the cases were exactly parallel, or were exactly the same; nor did I say that the consequences would be exactly the same. [Home-Rule cries of "Oh."]

"Mr. Bryce said that the right honorable gentleman had undoubtedly used the word 'exactly,' for he had taken it down at the time. [Cheers.] The House might be interested to know that there was absolutely no power whatever in any American court to arraign or deal with the action of any Legislature at all. [Loud cheers.] No American court had any power to do anything but administer the general law of the land. The highest law of the land was the Constitution of the United States. The next highest was that constituted by those statutes of Congress which had been made under the authority of the Constitution and in the scope of the Congressional powers; and if any act of a State Legislature transgressed the Constitution of the United States or a statute made by Congress, that act might, in a private case arising between parties, be judged to be in fact null and void [Ministerial cheers, and "Hear, hear," from Mr. J. Chamberlain]."

CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM IN BELGIUM.

PARIS, Feb. 12, 1892.

CHANGES in the Constitution of Belgium have been agitated for many years, and certain reforms have even served as war-cries for political parties, but hitherto in vain. Recently, however, the Chambers have taken up the matter so much in earnest that it may now be worth while to examine the questions at issue, and, while the Committee is considering the bill proposed by the Government, inquire into the changes which public sentiment is loudly demanding. That Parliament feels the pressure is evident from the attitude of all parties since the opening of the session in November, and the general feeling seems to have been expressed in the words of M. de Lantsheere, President of the Chamber of Deputies, who, in his speech accepting reëlection to the chair, declared that "the present session ought to be the session of revision, and it will be." The ministerial project was placed before the House a few days ago.

The charter under which Belgium has been living dates from the birth of the country as an independent monarchy, and has suffered no change since that time. Like all documents of its kind, it was the result of compromise between the various parties, and came out as none of its projectors expected. But the year 1831 was a trying time for Constitution-makers, for not only was the struggle for separation from Holland not definitely ended, but the breath of revolution was blowing from France upon a population at the same time highly inflammable and by instinct conservative. A form of government was finally evolved under which Belgium has, indeed, advanced and prospered, but which contained certain features by no means consistent with more modern notions of a parliamentary State. One of these features was the basis of suffrage, which rested on a property qualification. The right to vote for members of Parliament was limited to those who paid at least forty-two francs in direct taxes; and for participation in provincial and community affairs the payment of twenty and ten francs, respectively, was required. This was not a limitation which would have been felt as much at that time as at present, for not only was the population much smaller, but the lower classes had not begun to think so much for themselves. The disproportion between governors and governed was then not so apparent, but at the end of sixty years it has come to pass that, out of a population exceeding 6,000,000, only about 133,000 may vote for members of Parliament. According to a very low ratio of voters to population, there must be 600,000 men of mature age in Belgium who have nothing to say about national affairs, as they might have in the United States. The Radical party, led by Janson, demands the emancipation of this great body of citizens by the introduction of universal suffrage.

What form of the franchise will be finally voted is difficult to premise. Up to within a very short time, any extension of suffrage whatever was frowned upon in political circles. Even the Liberal party was suspicious of change, and the persistency of the Radical wing brought the matter to the front only at the expense of a decided party split and a victory lost to the Conservatives. The Ministry does not favor universal suffrage, but proposes to put it upon a household basis. A minority of the Centre demands a lowering of the property basis to that required for participation in provincial and community affairs, namely, a tax of ten to twenty francs. Hence the outlook for manhood suffrage is at present not very bright. Even Laveleye, whose last literary work was a series of articles on revision in the *Indépendance Belge*, expressed himself against it, saying that it would do very well for Switzerland, but that Belgium was too little accustomed to self-government to succeed well with the general franchise at present. The deprived working-classes are naturally in favor of the change. In 1890 a popular convention summoned to discuss the question brought together 50,000 workingmen, who, with deliberation and without any exhibition of disorder, formulated the demand for a voice in political affairs; but the ruling classes are almost to the last man Roman Catholic in faith and conservative by instinct, and at present the clerical element is in power after an overwhelming victory.

The articles of the Constitution which regulate the Parliamentary electorate are intimately connected with those which organize the Chambers, and certain changes are projected, also, in the latter. At present the Chamber of Deputies is elected by districts, several members being elected on the same list from each district, and the qualifications are the same as for voters, except that the representative must be at least twenty-five years of age. The Senators represent the nine provinces, but their number must always equal one-half the membership of the Chamber of Deputies, and they are apportioned to the provinces according to population. Deputies are elected for two years, and Senators for four, by the very same voters, the Senate coming directly from the people. There are no appointed Senators, as in most European Governments, the only exception being the Crown Prince, who becomes a member by right at the age of eighteen. But this upper house is chosen from a very limited body of citizens, for the Senator must be at least forty years of age, and pay about 2,000 francs annually in direct taxes. Every year lists are published for the edification of the proletariat, showing what persons are eligible to seats in the Senate, and if the actual number of those fully qualified is not sufficient properly to represent the province, enough more are added from citizens paying the highest taxes to make the proportion of possible candidates one to six thousand inhabitants.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We have here, indeed, a Senate which cannot be made the tool of the Executive or of the party in power, by increasing its numbers, but it is a chamber without particular weight, being simply another House of Deputies on a smaller scale. The choice of candidates is often so narrow that fitness has to be left out of the question, and the good expected from a representation of the large landed interests or money power of the country has never been realized. As compared with certain other clubs of millionaires, it has the redeeming feature that its members enter it by the acknowledged rights of wealth, not by the hidden effects of money. The revisionists, however, propose to abolish the property qualification, though they do not seem to change the principle of election. The range of choice will be greatly enlarged and the limitation of number to exactly one-half the other Chamber removed, so that whether the Senate remains a representation of class interests or is made simply another elective body as a guarantee of deliberation in law-making, its effectiveness will be increased.

Minor changes which the project desires to effect include a certain degree of minority representation which could be brought about by provinces constituting themselves, if they so desired, into single electoral districts. Another amendment removes the distinction between provincial representatives and deputies from the capital. The latter now receive no pay, while the former get something like 400 francs per month. The Ministry is inclined to grant the city residents at least half pay. Although the highest salary hardly removes the occupation from the class of gratuitous services, Senators receive no remuneration. It is further proposed to make not only the heir-presumptive a Senator by right, but to grant the same privilege to all the princes of the royal family. If it be well to educate the Crown Prince to the burdens of the throne, it is doubtless proper to give other possible heirs the same experience; but this might lead the royal family into unpleasant political entanglements, and vitiate the personal irresponsibility of the crown, whose burdens are now carried by a Ministry.

Vastly more far-reaching is the proposal to remove from the Chambers the power to verify the election of their own members. This is a reform not demanded by Belgium alone, for, with three or four exceptions, every parliamentary government in the world is suffering from the evils of partisan judgment in contested elections. Americans do not need to hear examples cited. France is equally tainted with the same disease, for committees on elections find justice confined to their own party there as much as in other republics. Hence this proposition to remove future election contests in Belgium from the elected body to a regular court of justice should be welcomed by all friends of good government, and should act as an incentive to fall into line with England and Canada in abolishing an abuse so flagrant. Exactly what form this amendment will take can be determined only later, for the Government simply expresses itself on the principle. It is interesting to note in passing that the very last efforts of Laveleye were given to the dictation of an article on the "Vérification des Pouvoirs," which was printed a few days after his death. The matter is very similar to the corresponding chapter in his book on 'Gouvernement dans la Démocratie,' but is applied to the case in hand. No stronger statement of the question than that given in that chapter (tome ii., ch. 8) is needed to show the evils of the present system. The proceedings of the Greek Parliament of 1890, there mentioned, recall the French congressional methods of a century before. "Purging" is not a lost art if it is still possible in Greece for the Opposition to come to the Chambers with forty-five adherents and be shortly reduced, by contested elections, to fifteen.

The territorial divisions of Belgium as now regulated are somewhat antiquated. The former relations of Luxembourg to the German Confederation no longer exist, and as for colonial connections, the Government desires that the civil status of the inhabitants of the Congo Free State be accurately defined. The succession to the throne is now by direct male succession in order of primogeniture. The party of the Centre proposed at first to add to this another limitation, to the effect that "no one is qualified to succeed to the constitutional office of chief of state who is not the issue of a marriage contracted with the consent of the legislative power." This proposition, however, was abandoned, and the project of the Ministry calls only for the consent of the King to such nuptials. In default of male heirs, the King may now appoint his successor with the consent of the Chambers, but as the wording of the article seems to confine this privilege to Leopold I., it is desirable to remove the ambiguity.

The most interesting amendment of all is the new form of veto which it is proposed to put into the hands of the King. At present the only recourse left for the chief executive, in case he does not favor a bill, is to dissolve one or both of the chambers and call a new Ministry. The royal veto final is as dead as it is in England, and a dissolution of Parliament is a step taken only after very serious consideration, and has occurred but four times in the history of the Belgian monarchy. The proposition is now made, however, to give the King the privilege of submitting a bill to popular vote, and to let him govern his signature by the result. This is not an executive act for which the Ministry is responsible, but a weapon with which to protect himself, or the people, against legislatures. It is a combination of the suspensive veto, as we know it, and the *referendum*. It is not like the *referendum* in Switzerland, for there the bill goes before the people, either by force of law, as provided for certain financial measures, or on petition, which may bring any project to popular vote. In Belgium this is left entirely to the judgment of the King, who may not use the privilege at all unless he desires.

The value of this measure from the democratic standpoint naturally depends on the legal conclusiveness of the plébiscite. In Switzerland the popular vote is final: the Legislature has nothing more to do with the law; it remains only for the Executive to declare the result of the election, which, if favorable, makes the bill a statute as soon as promulgated. If the Belgian plan simply gives the King an opportunity to test popular opinion, it becomes, indeed, a step in advance towards democracy, but not a long one. The effects will still depend on the personal qualities of the sovereign, and public opinion may or may not thus find an opportunity of expression. The details, however, await the discussion of the Chambers, and the chances may turn against the project altogether. Opinion is very much divided. The Government bill was not received with any great warmth in general when presented the other day, and the prospects are good for heated discussion. M. Woeste, the great leader of the Clerical party, was tempted into epigrams, and expressed the opinion that this "royal referendum is nothing but personal power tempered by plébiscites." But M. Woeste is not the dictator he once was. Others see in the measure a corrective for misrepresentation in the Legislature, and an opportunity to show changes in public opinion between the regular elections to Parliament. But the plan is so new that the chances for success on the merits of the question are narrow. Even the enlargement of the franchise has but just come to get a respectful hearing, and the Government is accused of heaping up new and untried measures in order to profit by the complexity of debate. It is to be hoped, however, that in time this combination of royalty and democracy will be tried. Belgium has on the whole presented a model of enlightened constitutional monarchy, and offers a good field for this new experiment.

The machinery of constitutional revision is comparatively simple. The Legislature has the right to declare that amendments are to be made to such and such articles, and after this statement the houses become legally dissolved. A new election must take place within forty days, and the new Parliament must assemble within two months after the dissolution. It is this body which finally enacts the amendments, and these become law when signed by the King. The present Legislature will, however, determine the general outline of changes at present in view, and make the great discussion of principles. The prospects for democracy are as yet uncertain. *Nous attendons.*

J. M. VINCENT.

RENAN'S 'DETACHED LEAVES.'

PARIS, February 18, 1892.

THERE is a great deal to be said, after all, for the doctrine of realism; nothing survives but what is real. A good book is a book which has, to use the modern language, *vécu*—lived. Who reads now the 'Natchez,' or 'The Last of the Abencerages,' or 'The Martyrs,' or 'The Genius of Christianity' of Chateaubriand? These books have become mere phantoms, while we are all capable of reading over the 'Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe.' Long, very long, is the list of the works published by Renan; how many of them will survive him? I was conversing some days ago on this very subject with some members of the French Academy; they all agreed that the book of Renan's which has the best chance of being read thirty or fifty years hence is 'Souvenirs d'Enfance et de Jeunesse.' The polemical, the exegetical works will be forgotten, or at least they will be as little read as some of Voltaire's attacks against the Church. Few books have produced in their time a greater sensation than the 'Vie de Jésus,' but the revolution produced by it in the public mind has, so to speak, already exhausted its effect. Ask Renan's publisher if the volumes which have followed the 'Vie de Jésus' sell as readily as this first volume, which was a declaration of war on Catholic dogmas.

Renan tells us himself that he had a visit from his publisher some time ago. They talked over the fourth volume of the 'History of the People of Israel.' Most people have quite enough of the people of Israel, and as this fourth volume could only be got ready for publication by the end of 1892, the publisher (who himself belongs to this famous people of Israel, as his name Lévy shows) said to Renan: "Could you not, meantime, give me a volume of miscellanies? What we want of you now" (I here cite textually the preface of Renan's new book) "is a volume in the style

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of your 'Souvenirs,' interesting to all, simple, personal." Note this word *personal;* we do want to know all about persons who have made great names for themselves. Sandeau, who was a colleague of Renan's in the French Academy, told him many years ago: "The public will always be satisfied when you speak of yourself." The new volume is conceived in this spirit. It is called 'Detached Leaves,'* and is made out of the leavings of the volume of 'Souvenirs,' with the addition of a little after-dinner speechmaking, of lectures, newspaper articles, academical discourses, and sundry letters.

The preface, as usual in Renan's books, is written with much care and is very characteristic. It is full of the lukewarm, commonplace optimism which has of late years been growing in Renan's intellect—an optimism which is a singular mixture of good nature and contempt, of a mild enthusiasm and mild indifference. Some friends of his were once discussing Victor Hugo; he began to speak, and praised almost with eloquence the genius of Hugo, his extraordinary imagination, the richness of his invention. After a while, when the flow of eloquence was over, somebody said: "That's all very well; but do tell us what will survive of Hugo's immense production a hundred years from now?" "What will survive? Well, well—nothing." Renan has invented a new kind of scepticism, a satisfied scepticism, which at times assumes the language of faith. Among the many articles in the new volume is a sort of philosophical examination of conscience, written in 1888:

"I have not much modified since," writes Renan, "my way of looking at the universe. More and more clearly I perceive that we know very little of what we should like to know. In philosophy, we must have confidence in the infinite goodness and guard ourselves against vain eagerness. We gain nothing by importuning truth, by soliciting it every day. Truth is deaf and cold; our ardor does not touch it. *Die neue Philosophie—die neuere Philosophie—die neueste Philosophie*—Heavens! how youthful these bids are! Why do we dispute about priority in error? Let us learn how to wait; there is perhaps nothing at the end of it. . . . Who knows? Perhaps truth is sad. Do not let us be in such a hurry to learn it."

Renan is surprised to see so much agitation in our French youth; he thinks that youth ought to be serene. "Have these young men not read the history of philosophy, nor Ecclesiastes—'The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be'? Why should you, dear children, give yourselves such headaches merely in order to end by changing your error? Amuse yourselves, since you are only twenty years old, and work also." And why should they work? you may say. In order to study science; for if philosophy is barren, science is not. There is always a harvest to be made in that field. If I were tempted to be more of a Renan than Renan himself, I would tell him that science, after it has fed me, and clothed me, and warmed me, is nothing to me, after all, if it does not give me a philosophy. I am sure I could find a hundred pages in the works of Renan expressing the greatest contempt for a purely material civilization. In this very preface, I read: "We shall have evil days: moral stocks will fall, it is certain; already the spirit of sacrifice has nearly disappeared. We see the day coming when everything will be the object of a syndicate, when organized egotism will replace love and devotion. Our century has made more and more perfect material tools, without seeing that the use of these tools supposes a certain amount of morality, of conscience, of abnegation." "Never mind," he says, a moment afterwards; "the resources of humanity are infinite. Eternal works will be accomplished, and the spring of living force, always coming to the surface, will never become dry. Science especially will continue to astonish us by its revelations, which will put the infinite of space and time in the place of a creationism that satisfies no longer the imagination even of a child."

I can only compare this method and this style to the movement of a pendulum. All established religions are wrong, all dogmas are fallacies; but "as two parallels meet in the infinite, so does religion become true in the infinite." Here and there, there is a touch of humor: after having praised virtue, he adds: "If virtue were a good investment, business men, who are so sagacious, would long ago have remarked it; they would all be virtuous. No, in the finite order it is a bad investment; but, in the infinite, all contradictions efface themselves." Renan has of late years discovered that the greatest virtue, the greatest recompense of a good life, is gayety. In the little after-dinner speeches which he makes in some of the Breton clubs, he is never tired of praising gayety; he has discovered it in Brittany, which had always been represented to us as full of gloom and melancholy. A gay Gascon seems very natural, but a gay Breton—well, Renan will have it that his compatriots are naturally very gay. "N'est pas gai qui veut," he says. "In order to be gay, you must belong to an old race, not *blasée;* you must also be satisfied with your own life."

This satisfaction is complete in Renan; it is sincere, and it gives him a sort of clerical serenity which is at times agreeable and sometimes also irritating. "My life," he says, "has been what I wished, what I conceived as the best. If I had to begin it anew, I would not change it much. On the other hand, I have a little fear of the future. I shall have my biography and my legend." He amuses himself with making this legend, having had some experience of ecclesiastical writers. "The legends of the enemies of the official Church are all cast in the same mould. The end which the Acts attribute to Judas (*crepuit medius*) is the necessary foundation of them. For one part of the tradition I shall end thus, in a manner combined of Arius and of Voltaire. Heavens, how black I shall be!—all the blacker that the Church, when she feels she is lost, will end in malice; she will bite like a mad dog."

To speak frankly, this seems to me in very bad taste; these pleasantries are forced, and seem to me vulgar. Who can tell what figure he will make in the great "Todtentanz"? Renan seems to me to care more than he says about the pious correspondent he speaks of, who writes to him regularly every three months these words: "There is a hell." He writes, it is true:

"This person . . . does not frighten me as much as he believes. I should like to be sure that there is a hell. For I prefer the hypothesis of hell to that of nothingness. Many theologians think that for the damned it is better to be than not to be, and that these unfortunates are perhaps accessible to many a good thought. As for myself, I imagine that if the Eternal, in his severity, should send me first to that dreadful place, I should succeed in getting out of it. I would send up to my Creator a supplication which would make him smile. The reasonings which I would make in order to prove to him that it is by his fault that I am damned, would be so subtle that he would have some difficulty in answering me. Perhaps he would finally admit me into his holy paradise, which must be very tedious."

The preferences of Renan are for purgatory, for there you meet the amiable sinners—those who have walked, as he does himself, on the tight-rope between virtue and vice, between corruption and incorruption—those who have led pendulous lives. He would like to meet them in this purgatory, which he represents to himself as an immense park, under a polar light, full of dark shrubberies, "where are purified loves begun on earth. What delicious novels are there finished! how little people must be in a hurry to leave it, especially for a monotonous paradise!" When you read such lines you often ask yourself, Is the author serious? What does he really mean? Is he laughing more at himself or at us? What notion has he of the mission of a writer? The extraordinary fluidity of Renan's style is the outward expression of a fluidity of thought, of belief, of unbelief, which is truly extraordinary. I have only touched so far on the philosophical part of his new work; there is another part on which I must dilate at some length—I mean the social part, the views which Renan takes of the relations of morality. But I have no more space to-day to touch on these delicate questions.

* 'Recollections and Letters.' Translated by Isabel F. Hapgood. New York: Cassell Publishing Co.

Correspondence.

PARTIES AND THE NATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It is very instructive to see the exultation of the Republican papers over the helplessness of the Democrats and their inability to make any progress with the public business. The argument is, in substance: "We are bad enough, but the other fellows are worse. You will have to come back to us." Is it not a pitiful thing for this great country that the question which the people are called upon to decide, is not which party is the best, but which is the worst? If anybody supposes that the Republican party, if it returns to power, will be merely what it has been, he is laboring under a grievous delusion. On the plea that its past action has been endorsed by the people, it will plunge into a fresh course of iniquities, and in its turn be displaced by a Democratic party still more helpless and disorganized. And so we shall go on, from bad to worse, till the country discovers that the root of the trouble is not in either party, but in the defective organization of the Government business. Meantime, the situation is a difficult one for the independent voter.

The matter cannot be better illustrated than by the state of the pension bills. As the *Evening Post* points out, neither party has the courage to offer the smallest opposition to this gigantic swindle. The reason of this is, that every member stands in direct awe of an active and influential minority of his local constituents, while he has personally nothing to hope or fear from the country at large. The Treasury, which is the real sufferer for the country, has no authorized representative or defender in Congress, while the impersonal and collective responsibility for its condition sits very lightly upon the members of either party, as compared with their relations to an eager group of political workers at home, especially when those relations are manipulated by a powerful and determined lobby.

Mr. Reed, in his article in the *North American*, says (and the sentence is an epitome of his whole argument), that the "billion-dollar"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED.

Congress appropriated the money because the citizens of this country, who are the rulers of it, demanded it; upon which the inquiry at once arises, What citizens? If he means the citizens who pack caucuses and conventions and make members of Congress, the plea is no justification. If he means the 65,000,000 of inhabitants, minus the small percentage who benefit by pensions, the reply is that they have never been asked.

Suppose that Mr. David B. Hill were to succeed in packing the conventions of other States as he did that of New York, and were to persuade the country that, bad as he is, he is not as bad as the Republican candidate (and a case suggests itself in which even that argument might be maintained), would anybody dare to say that he was the choice of the people of the United States?

The truth is, that if this country is ever to redeem itself from the slough into which it is falling—if it is not to fail disastrously in its great mission as the champion and exponent of popular government before the world—some provision has got to be made for the expression of the will at least of the majority of the nation as a whole; and the only visible method is to give to the President and his Cabinet that share and voice in the guidance of legislation without which administration itself is nothing but an instrument for the intrigues and quarrels, the greed and the ambition, of contending factions. G. B.

Boston, March 5, 1892.

FREE COINAGE AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: "Will the silver of Europe be thrown upon America when free coinage is established?" This is a question discussed by Mr. Leech and Mr. Bland in the March *Forum*. I think it will not, but upon grounds very different from those assigned by Mr. Bland. If free coinage, in the form of the Bland Bill, accompanied by certificates issued against bullion, comes at all, it will not be before June, 1894, and then only if the Democratic Convention nominate Hill or some Western man not pledged against such a measure. When the free-coinage bill becomes a law, its effect will have long been foreseen, and will *at once* come to pass in its full force. This effect will be simply that 371¼ grains of pure silver will be worth no more after the impress of the silver dollar is put upon them than before. Hence, no one in Germany, Austria, France, or Italy will have the least reason or motive for carrying his silver across the ocean to the United States.

I feel not at all sure that our gold coins will be exported. They will simply circulate at a premium. The necessities of the case will regulate the premium and keep them from fluctuating too wildly. It is very likely that ten-dollar gold pieces will come to pass, as a matter of course, as fourteen-dollar pieces. I recollect distinctly how in Prussia, in 1848, and for years before, Friedrich's-d'ors, nominally five-thaler pieces, were paid out at 5⅜ thalers, with as much regularity as if they had borne the inscription 5 thaler 20 groschen. We may thus have a truly bimetallic currency—though not in the sense in which some of the advocates of silver coinage predict, yet in the sense in which the rank and file of the silver party desire it, namely, that ten dollars' worth of either gold or silver, as measured by the present standard, will pay fourteen dollars of debt.

If there is to be a national bankrupt law, I think that between Torrey's bill and Bland's the latter is the most economical and simple. No clerk or register, no assignee or trustee, no marshal or messenger, no creditors' meetings, no suits to assail preferences, no opposition to discharges. Every man pays 70 cents on the dollar of what he owes, and gets his receipt in full. Solon tried the same relief measure in Attica 600 years B. C. In times nearer our own, such a measure worked itself out by the depreciation of the greenback. It may have its advantages. But let us freely admit that free coinage means this and nothing more.

Yours truly, L. N. D.

Louisville, Ky., March 1, 1892.

[Mr. Leech discusses in the *Forum* the question, "Would free coinage bring European silver here?" He holds that it would, but his whole argument goes on the hypothesis that there would be some period of time, long or short, during which silver could be brought to this country and exchanged for gold, dollar for dollar—*i. e.*, 412½ grains of the former for 25.8 grains of the latter (both of standard fineness). Now, we do not think there would be any such time, even one minute. We think that there would be a run on the Treasury and a forced suspension of gold payments before any free-coinage law could get into operation. After a suspension of gold payments, the holders of silver could get gold only by buying it as they do now. They could cheat creditors, and they might sell silver to "the debtor class" for a while at something more than the preëxisting rate. Mr. Leech says: "The moment our currency reached a silver basis, when our legal-tender paper money could only be exchanged for silver dollars, the profit to the foreign silver-owner for the interchange of his silver for our gold would cease, and silver would be imported then only as an exchange matter, just as gold is now." Quite true. We think that that interchange would never have a chance to begin.—Ed. Nation.]

BOND-SELLING BY THE TREASURY.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Statements like the following, from page 140 of your last issue, have frequently been made by writers on the subject, yet, as it seems to me, their erroneousness becomes apparent so soon as we follow to its practical operation the proposed remedy:

"Foreigners overlook the fact that the Secretary has the power, and is charged with the duty, of selling bonds if necessary to maintain gold payments. There is no reason to suppose that he would fail to apply this remedy in a crisis, *or that the remedy would prove inadequate.*"

I assume that you, in suggesting the selling of bonds, have in mind that by the conditions of the sale they are to be paid for in gold, since in a crisis the sale of them for any other kind of money would not help matters to any great extent. And by a "crisis" I assume that you mean a tendency to insist on the Government paying its greenbacks or other obligations in gold. However, even though you do not mean either of these things, they are what is meant and expressed by others who have with confidence used the same argument as yours, and may therefore seem worthy of consideration in your columns.

The idea is, then, that in order to get gold with which to meet the demands of those who present (say) greenbacks for redemption, the Government will replenish its supply of gold by selling its bonds for gold, refusing to accept greenbacks, Treasury notes, silver certificates, national-bank bills, or silver dollars.

Now, I claim that so long as the Treasury keeps these different kinds of money at a parity—and it is only to keep them at a parity that the sale of bonds is to be made—it will be impossible for it, in effect, to avoid taking in payment for such bonds money other than gold.

Suppose, for instance, that the Government does give notice of having bonds to sell for gold at the New York Sub-Treasury, and that a Wall Street banker possessed of $1,000,000 in greenbacks, but no gold, desires to invest it at the price at which the bonds are selling. All that he has to do is to go to the redemption department of the Sub-Treasury and exchange his greenbacks for gold, and then at once take this gold to the bond-selling department of the same building and hand it in in payment of his bond purchase. To say that the redemption department would not give the gold for the greenbacks, is to say that what we suppose the Government to be trying to avert is an accomplished fact.

Can any one doubt that should the Treasury ever, by the sale of bonds, advertise its precarious condition, the bonds would thus be purchased with its own gold withdrawn for that very purpose; and that the most that could thus be accomplished would be the withdrawal of some of the existing $346,000,000 of greenbacks? Any existing preference for gold over other money would by such action be increased rather than diminished, and the Treasury would probably have to pay out at one window more than it took in at the other.

If in like manner we follow through its practical workings the selling of our bonds abroad, it does not seem any more effective to accomplish the desired result, since the spot selected for making such sales has little influence in determining who are the real purchasers. The bonds would go to those willing to give the most for them, and such men care very little whether they send their bid to Wall or to Lombard Street. The Wall Street banker whom we before supposed to wish to invest $1,000,000 in them, would have the same wish in this latter case, and would proceed in much the same way to accomplish his end. As before, his greenbacks he would exchange at the Sub-Treasury for gold. Instead of at once returning this to the Sub-Treasury, however, he would take it to a dealer in foreign exchange, and, by means of the telegraph, inside of a few hours, if need be, the same weight of English sovereigns or gold bullion would be handed over to the London agent of our Government in purchase of the bonds. In fact, these elements of distance and time, which do not in the least interfere with the desire of the purchaser, might be very unfortunate for the Treasury. Its supply of gold might be very seriously lessened before the returns from the sale of its bonds could reach it.

In whatever way I look at the subject, it seems an absurdity for the Treasury, with a view to increasing its gold supply or restoring confidence, to discriminate against any kind of money in the sale of its bonds, and at the same

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time continue to redeem in gold that same money. EDWARD F. SWEET.

CHICAGO, February 29, 1892.

[If the Government revenues were doubled, the silver crisis would be staved off indefinitely, because in that case the purchase of silver would not be an appreciable embarrassment. The silver notes put out would come back for redemption whenever they were in excess, but there would always be means to redeem them, and they would pile up in the Treasury. The law says that they "may be reissued," but there is no way to reissue them except in payment of Government debts; and under the hypothesis, the Government has sufficient money coming in to pay all its debts. The situation, therefore, would be simply a redundant revenue and the application of a portion of it to the purchase of silver bullion. It might be pig-iron, or pig-lead; the effects would be the same.

Now, the sale of bonds is, for all the purposes we are considering, the same thing as an addition to the revenues. It has the same effect upon the maintenance of gold payments. The fact that the bonds must be redeemed at maturity is a separate fact, interesting in itself, and having its own consequences, the most important of which is a probable increase of taxation to meet them. But for the present the effect of bond sales is simply an increase of Treasury receipts. If anybody can see how an increase derived from ordinary sources would stave off the silver crisis, he should be able to see how an increase derived from extraordinary sources would produce the same result.—ED. NATION.]

THE EDUCATION OF SOUTHERN YOUTH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your paper of the 25th inst., now before me, I read, under the caption of "An Interesting Question," your comment upon the editorial of the St. Louis *Republic*, and on what the Buffalo *Courier* also had to say upon what, for us of the South at least, might be called a *painfully* interesting question. The comments of the three papers are correct; but as far as the causes that have led to this condition of things in the South are concerned, all has not been stated, and the most painful effects not even been hinted at.

As to the causes in the Southern States: after the war, bread was the first cry, followed by the insatiable appetite for money-getting, to enjoy once again after four years the mere comforts of life. This led fathers of families to take their half-educated sons into their stores and offices, that the salaries they must pay if employers, or earn if they were employees, might aid in the family support; and the girls, after the household duties were performed, were put to their books under the mother's charge as schoolmistress. Consequently, the proportion of girls and young women who were being educated largely exceeded the number of boys and young men. Then, too, be it remembered, there were comparatively few schools and colleges open in the South for a year or two after the close of the war. And still another cause must be mentioned — one that should not have existed, though easy for us of the Southern States to understand. So many half-grown boys, and war-grown young men, had either been in the active army, or in the reserves, or at posts and depots, or in charge of the planting or other business of the fathers and elder brothers in the field, that when the war was over, these youngsters, having proved themselves to be in deeds, felt that in fact they were, men; a few—very few—were willing to return to their books, and full parental control was hard to establish. Had these war-worn and almost despairing parents (for the mothers were perhaps more worn than the fathers) had the means and the moral strength to insist upon their sons' returning to their studies, the young women of to-day would not so frequently have to complain of the want of intellectuality of their male friends.

Then as to the effects: in ante-bellum times parental control in the South "went without saying," and children looked up in deference to their elders—though not in fear of them. Now this is largely changed; young men, still in their teens, do not expect to ask permission to leave their homes after tea for the theatre or billiard-room, nor to account for either the hour or the condition in which they return. A general want of deference is observable on the part of the young to the old: the lifting of the hat is almost obsolete, and the man of middle age is fortunate if his friend's pert son does not call him by his Christian or nickname. This state of things, in the providence of God and the influence of his handmaidens, the future mothers, will cure itself; but to hasten it, fathers who can afford it (even when, as is largely the case, those who can afford it nowadays in the South are so-called "self-made men") should force their sons to take an education, even if they keep them at grammar and high schools until they reach their majority; and, failing in this, should enforce the law parental, at least in the homestead, and, like the wise German fathers, consider the son's wages as due to the head of the family until the fatted calf is killed and the christening bottle of wine broached on the twenty-first birthday.—Respectfully,

JAMES G. HOLMES.

CHARLESTON, S. C., February 27, 1892.

IS INDUCTION AN INFERENCE?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the communication of Maxime Bôcher in the *Nation* of February 18, referring to the unsatisfactory condition of geometrical studies in our schools, he says:

"If we could lead the student first to see the truth of a proposition, and then, perhaps much later, to prove it, we might hope in time to have mathematicians in America. For every mathematical discovery is made in this way, let the mathematician conceal his footprints as he will; it must come as an intuition, and the man to whom it has thus come is its discoverer, even though he never succeed in finding a proof."

Is not this statement of general application? Is ever the boundary of knowledge advanced in any other way, whether in mathematical or physical science? Reasoning serves merely to verify and confirm the intuitions of genius by applying general principles to concrete cases; but *inference*, in any proper sense of the word, cannot *advance* knowledge—it cannot grasp more than is contained in the premise.

I know the common doctrine represents this as the province of induction. But induction is not reasoning; it is intuition, or happy guessing, if you like. Take any so-called inductive syllogism, and substitute for the major premise what is tacitly assumed, and it is converted at once into a strictly deductive argument. By no possible reasoning, or *inference* proper, could Newton have attained to the law of gravity. It was a happy guess, an inspiration of genius. It was based on wide knowledge, it is true; but it was not a necessary consequence of that knowledge. Assuming the law to be true, reasoning applied it, and the conclusions were found to agree with experience and observation. But the conception of the law was an intuition; it was not a *conclusion* involved in any known premises.

Take Whately's old school-book illustration of an inductive syllogism: "The ox, sheep, goat, deer, bison, etc., are a sample of the class 'horned animal,' or represent the class; the ox, sheep, etc., are ruminants, therefore all horned animals are ruminants." But what do you mean by "the ox, sheep, etc., are a sample, or represent the class 'horned animal'"? Evidently you mean that whatever is true of them is true of all horned animals. Unless this is true, your conclusion is worthless. But if you substitute this, which is tacitly assumed, the argument is deductive, not inductive. The same is true in every case of so-called inductive argument. The real induction—the advance in our bounds—is contained in the assumption that what is true in the cases we know will be found true in all cases having a certain other similarity to these. But this is not an inference, it is not reasoning, it is intuition.

J. McL. S.

DAYTON, O.

[It is plain that in no case of genuine induction is *everything* that is true of the sample true of the whole class; so, according to our correspondent, all inductions must be worthless. But he supports this position by nothing, nor does he notice a single one of the objections to it which have been urged from the days of Philodemus to our own, and are found in common American books, such as the 'Studies in Logic, by Members of Johns Hopkins University.' The main distinction between induction and statistical deduction (the only kind of deduction which bears much resemblance to induction) is that the prediction made by the deductive form of inference is applicable in many cases, and, while it may be false in any one, it will probably and approximately be true in the long run; but the inductive conclusion, on the other hand, may be false—only, if so, the further pursuit of the same method will in the long run probably and approximately *correct* it. The distinction is between getting confirmed in the long run and being corrected in the long run.

Our correspondent's proposition that induction is not inference will meet with less favor than it might do, owing to his use of the unfortunate word *inference*, which most people particularly appropriate to the designation of uncertain presumption, amounting to little more than conjecture. But in its philosophical sense inference is defined in the 'Century Dictionary' as "the formation of a belief or opinion, not as directly observed, but as constrained by observations made of other matters or by beliefs already adopted." For instance, we wish, let us suppose, to know whether

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

among negroes male births are more numerous than female births or not. This general proposition cannot be directly observed. We turn, then, to the compendium of the tenth census, and find a considerable excess of female over male births there recorded among negroes in this country for one year. This brings us to the belief that the same phenomenon would generally occur among large populations of negroes, and our proceeding is *inference* according to the received definition, as certainly as it is induction.

But the 'Century Dictionary' adds this remark: "The act of inference consists psychologically in constructing in the imagination a sort of diagram or skeleton image of the essentials of the state of things represented in the premises, in which, by mental manipulation and contemplation, relations which had not been noticed in constructing it are discovered." This recognizes an intuitive or perceptive element as an important part of reasoning itself—a doctrine which results from the study of the logic of relatives, where the perceptive element comes into great prominence. Proof believed to be conclusive has been offered of the truth of this view, which has been accepted by many philosophers. "J. McL. S." seems to offer no rational objection to it. He says, indeed, that Newton's discovery was "a happy guess, an inspiration of genius"—that is, it came directly from on high, or from the action of chance, and was not based upon any knowledge already in Newton's mind, or dependent from any luminous conception which he had carefully worked out. But the truth is, our correspondent seems to have taken his notion of reasoning from the 'Elements of Euclid,' which was written before logic was much understood, and from texts-books of logic inspired by theological doctors. If, as he says, "reasoning serves merely to verify [something] by applying general principles to particular cases," there is next to no reasoning in mathematics; for the *nodus* of a mathematical demonstration does not consist in the application of a general principle.

The original passage quoted has some truth in it. The mathematician usually sees a thing dimly before he sees it clearly. But between the processes of coming to see a mathematical truth as probable, and coming to see it as evident, there is no radical difference. It is all reasoning, and, as such, it is an act of perception—or, rather, of experiment, followed by observation.—Ed. Nation.]

"YOU WAS."

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Mr. T. L. Kington Oliphant, in *The New English* (1886), vol. ii., p. 133, referring to Dr. Bentley's *Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris* (1699), writes: "The new use of *was*, just coming in, is seen in p. 299; 'when *you was* a boy.'" The fact, however, is, that the expression instanced was current at least ten years before Dr. Bentley was born, and all along in the latter half of the seventeenth century:

"But thus you will not have the same Indiuiduall Soul *you was* Christened with." Rev. Dr. Henry More, *The Second Lash of Alazonomastix* (1651), in *Enthusiasmus Triumphatus* (1656), p. 262. More has *you was* in his *Antidote against Idolatry* (1664), O 4 *v.*, *Divine Dialogues* (1668), vol. ii., p. 554, *Letters*, etc., also.

"Having known that *you was* there." "After *you was* departed from Valence." "*You was* about to marry the widow." Anon., Translation of *The History of Don Fenise* (1651), pp. 120, 240, 242.

"I have heard that *you*, Polymachus, *was* much offended when Aganacton was sick of this disease." Rev. Dr. Nathanael Ingelo, *Bentivolio and Urania* (1660), Part i., p. 108 (ed. 1682).

"What *was you* saying?" John Wilson (1664), *Works* (1874), p. 204.

"*You*, your self, *was* pleased particularly to shew me the place." Dr. Henry Stubbe (1670), *A Reply to a Letter of Dr. Henry More* (1671), p. 63.

"*You . . . was.*" Dryden and Lee, *Duke of Guise* (1682), Act IV.

"My sister told me *you was* pleased . . . to wonder I did so seldom write to you." Dean Swift (1692), *Letter to William Swift*, Nov. 29.

Other quotations could be given, as from Sir Aston Cokain (1658 and 1662), *Works* (ed. 1874), pp. 96, 297; and from Charles Cotton (1664), *Poetical Works* (ed. 1765), p. 62.

Mr. Barrett Wendell, in his *English Composition* (1891), p. 79, observes: "A slight examination of some of the best writers of the last century will show that, certainly as late as the time of Fielding, there was a great deal of good authority for *you was*, when the second person singular was intended." Fielding published from 1730 till 1754, the year of his death; and nearly all that he wrote was of the lighter cast of literature. But, as is shown below, in such literature, and more especially in familiar epistolary correspondence, *you was* continued to enjoy good repute long after his days:

"I find *you was* no more born for servitude than myself." Bp. William Warburton (1758), in *Letters from a Late Eminent Prelate* (ed. 1809), p. 263. In sixteen other passages in this volume, dated between 1749 and 1775, Warburton has *you was*.

"*You*, I was told, had been married, and *was* a widow." Mrs. Frances Sheridan, *Memoirs of Miss Sidney Bidulph* (1761), vol. iii., p. 119.

"*You was* the most lovely person in the world." "I learned, from Don Carlos, that *you was* resolved to go away with him." Oliver Goldsmith (*a.* 1774), Translation of Scarron's *Comic Romance* (1775), vol. i., p. 125; vol. ii., p. 83.

"As I told you, when *you was* here." "*You*, I think, *was* never a dabbler in rhyme." William Cowper (1780 and 1786), *Works* (1835–1837) vol. iv., p. 16; vol. vi., p. 17. Other instances of *you was* occur in vol. xv., pp. 33, 34, 45, 68.

"*You was* prevented, by Sir Joshua Reynolds, in your kind intentions of giving me the earliest notice of the honour you have done me." Bp. Jonathan Shipley (1780), in *Lord Teignmouth's Memoirs of Sir William Jones* (ed. 1806), p. 194.

"I am sorry *you was* disappointed of going to Vallombrosa." Horace Walpole (1791), in *The Journals and Correspondence of Miss Berry* (1865), vol. i., p. 367.

For *you was* could also be quoted: Dr. Hawkesworth (1773), in *The Private Correspondence of David Garrick* (1831, 1832), vol. i., p. 536; Miss Elizabeth Carter (1785), *Letters to Mrs. Montagu* (1817), vol. iii., p. 258, and often before; Richard Cumberland, *The Natural Son* (1786), *passim*; with many other writers between 1760 and 1800.

The quotations which follow are not without interest:

"*Was you* ever in Dovedale?" Lord Byron (1817), *Works* (1837-1840), vol. iii., p. 369.

"I understand that Pillans is to be succeeded by Carson, whom, if I am not mistaken, you saw while *you was* at Edinburgh." Professor Dugald Stewart (after 1819), in *Dr. Parr's Works* (1828), vol. vii., p. 552.

Byron, it may be surmised, picked up *was you* in Scotland, where, as I know from my own observation, it is still used by persons fairly well educated.

Writing of *was*, I am reminded of the barbarisms *I were* and *he were*, indicative; often heard, here in Suffolk, from rustics when, in addressing their superiors, instead of speaking naturally, they aim to speak elegantly. A neighbor of mine, a cottage-woman, giving her opinion of a clergyman, an Oxford graduate, who had lately visited her parochially, remarked that he could have had but little schooling. By way of a reason for this conclusion, she added that he had said, "I *was* there the other day." I asked whether she preferred "I *were*." "Of course," was her reply. The very elementary lesson in grammar which I thereupon ventured had, however, the effect, I perceived, of only convincing her that I was as great an ignoramus as the Oxonian cleric. This result was not wholly unexpected.

Your obedient servant, F. H.

Marlesford, England, Feb. 10, 1892.

AUGHT AND NAUGHT.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Surely there can be no disputing Mr. Hempl's account of the misuse of *aught* for *naught;* but his conclusion, that it may be "about time to recognize usage" as justifiable, may be questioned. *Naught* means *nothing:* will even the use of *aught* one hundred times instead of ninety-nine make *aught* mean *nothing?* In *adder*, *apron*, *auger*, *umpire*, the dropping of the first letter has led to no confusion. Shall we use *aught* for *nothing*, and say of an empty argument, or an empty bottle, that there is *aught* in it?

You supply "one classical use of *aught.*" Why only one, if the spelling of Hosea Biglow is to be considered classical? There are four such classicalities in the two lines you quote: *wy* instead of *why*, *aught* for *naught*, *fredum* for *freedom*, and *'twuz* for *'twas*.

W. J. Linton.

New Haven, Conn., February 26, 1892.

[Though but lookers-on in this discussion, we may observe that *aught* and *naught* present no greater contradiction than *either* and *neither*. Yet when Defoe writes, "However, I do not tell you that this was all at once neither," and we rewrite "——all at once either," precisely the same sense is conveyed. So "I can but believe," "I cannot but believe," etc. Mr. Linton's other "classicalities" belong in the phonetic category, and do not call for notice in a dictionary of orthography and etymology.—Ed. Nation.]

TOLSTOI AUTOGRAPHS FOR STARVING RUSSIA.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: I have two autograph letters from Count L. N. Tolstoi, the famous author. Autographs of Count Tolstoi are rare, and I should like to sell these for the benefit of the starving Russian peasants.

Letter No. 1 is in English, with a few words of Russian. It refers to 'Robert Elsmere,' and to the Count's own 'Walk in the Light.'

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letter No. 2, which is longer, is also in English, with the exception of one Russian paragraph, which I will translate for the buyer. It expresses the great author's gratitude to America for her help and sympathy in Russia's present distress, and contains some characteristic remarks on the subject of autographs.

Both letters possess the advantage of giving specimens of the Count's English and Russian handwritings. I guarantee their genuineness.

I will receive bids for both these letters, separately, by number, until March 20, when I will award them to the persons who have offered the largest prices. In view of the object for which I consent to part with them, I hope the prices offered will be generous.

ISABEL F. HAPGOOD.

9 EAST TWENTY-SECOND STREET,
NEW YORK, March 2, 1892.

"MR. COLE'S ENGRAVINGS"—A NEW SERIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The *Nation* for March 3 printed an interesting suggestion from Mr. William J. Stillman with regard to a subscription scheme for new examples of Mr. Cole's engravings from the old masters. Though the proposition seemed to be authoritative, it was written, evidently, without a knowledge of Mr. Cole's latest plans. While it is true that Mr. Cole has finished the series of engravings from the old Italian masters now being printed in the *Century Magazine*, and hereafter to be issued in book form, it will be a mistake to infer that the *Century* Company has withdrawn its support from Mr. Cole's preferred work among the art treasures of Europe. He has recently engaged to produce another series in a new field for the *Century Magazine*, and this will keep his burin fully occupied for a long time to come. We offer this correction because inquiries are coming to us in furtherance of Mr. Stillman's suggestion, based on the supposition that Mr. Cole was in need of support to continue his work. THE CENTURY CO.

NEW YORK, March 7.

[We have no knowledge of the facts beyond the above letter and Mr. Stillman's. To the latter's project we have received several adhesions. They should be sent directly to him, addressed simply Rome, Italy.—ED. NATION.]

Notes.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS announce 'Across the Plains, with Other Memories and Essays,' by Robert Louis Stevenson; 'Essays on German Literature,' by Prof. H. H. Boyesen; 'Potiphar's Wife, and Other Poems,' by Sir Edwin Arnold; and 'The Dead Nymph, and Other Poems,' by Charles Henry Lüders.

Macmillan & Co. have nearly ready 'Gossip of the Century'; 'The Three Fates,' a story of New York by F. Marion Crawford; and 'A Picture of Pauperism,' by Charles Booth.

'A Human Document,' by W. H. Mallock, is in the press of the Cassell Publishing Co.

Harper & Bros. will shortly issue 'Studies in American Architecture,' by Montgomery Schuyler; and 'Tributes to Shakspere,' mainly in verse, compiled by Mary R. Silsby.

A popular 'Life of Balzac,' by his translator, Miss Katherine Wormeley, is in preparation for publication by Roberts Bros., Boston.

The Messrs. Longman will publish 'The Spanish Story of the Armada, and Other Essays,' by J. A. Froude.

The fourth volume of Moltke's *Gesammelte Schriften*, now in press, will contain a biographical sketch of the Field-Marshal by an officer of the General Staff, with interesting reminiscences of his youth and his reasons for exchanging the Danish for the Prussian service in 1822, and thus taking the most important step in his career. Preparations are also being made for the speedy publication of Moltke's 'Militarische Werke,' which will include his correspondence on military affairs during the wars of 1864, 1866, and 1870–71, the records of his activity as Chief of the General Staff of the Army, and other writings on military matters, partly historical and partly technical or professional.

Mr. A. H. Bullen's admirable collection of 'Lyrics from Elizabethan Dramatists' (Scribners) has been reprinted in a smaller and cheaper edition. Some of the poems have been omitted, as being less adapted for a popular issue, and the original collection is supplemented by the poems of Greene and Lodge, extracted from the editor's 'Lyrics from Elizabethan Romances.' The volume as it stands therefore fully represents the lyric poetry of the age, and contains the best of it.

Two new volumes have recently been added to Dickens literature. The collection of the 'Letters of Charles Dickens to Wilkie Collins' (Harpers), under the conscientious editorship of Mr. Laurence Hutton, was noticed by us on their original publication in *Harper's Magazine*, and their appearance in book form calls for no further comment except to say that we have here one chapter of that life of the novelist which Forster did not succeed in writing, and which must be sought by lovers of Dickens in detached fragments like this. At the same time, one should add that Dickens does not take any rank among English authors as a letter-writer. He never achieved more than a "note," whether long or short.

The second volume is an account, by William R. Hughes, of a week's journey among the scenes associated with Dickens or his characters, under the title 'A Week's Tramp in Dickensland' (Boston: Estes & Lauriat). This is a large book for its title, and contains over four hundred pages of exceedingly fragmentary description, personal reminiscences of Dickens collected on the journey, apt extracts from the works, facsimiles of this, that, and the other, and more than a hundred illustrations, of which half are new and the remainder reproduced from other Dickens publications. The whole makes an abundant scrapbook of Dickensiana, and is everywhere pervaded by an intense loyalty to its hero, who is exalted to make a third with Shakspere and Scott; but this is the right tone for such a collector as the author.

Echoes of the strife at Oxford between the friends of literature and the adherents of philology, on the subject of the precise terms on which modern literature shall be established as a study at the University, are brought to us in J. Churton Collins's 'Study of English Literature: A Plea for its Recognition and Organization at the Universities' (Macmillan). The volume is made up largely of articles previously contributed to different English magazines, and is a long and vehement argument for the literary as opposed to the philological method of study. The question is treated too closely in connection with English conditions to be of great value to educational discussion here, but those who are interested in the methods of teaching literature (and the methods in American schools and colleges are mostly unsatisfactory or experimental) may derive some suggestions from the volume. In our judgment the author does not wholly succeed in avoiding the objection that vagueness of treatment is inherent in the literary method, and that consequently examination or any test of progress made or work done is difficult. Many of his suggested questions for examination exhibit this vagueness in an exaggerated form, particularly where he undertakes to deal with foreign sources and influences in English literature; and hence his cause suffers by overstatement. We do not mean to intimate a doubt as to the rightness of his cause; but the fact ought frankly to be admitted that the philologists have a developed method of teaching, definitely made out and long tested, by which they are reasonably sure of obtaining the results aimed at, while those who insist on the "literary" method have an experiment on their hands, and must be contented to leave some matters in question to the proof of time.

A new Life of Jane Austen, by Oscar Fay Adams (Chicago: McClurg), attests the hardy nature of the fame of the favorite female author of the beginning of the century, which lives and flourishes in the midst of the dense growth of the modern press, apparently little affected by time and change. The charm her novels exercise is one of the problems of criticism which are difficult because of their simplicity. Mr. Adams cannot be said to throw light on the matter, but he has written very conscientiously all he could find covering the character of his author and the circumstances of her quiet life, and the labor has been one of devotion.

'The Moral Crusader, William Lloyd Garrison' (Toronto: Williamson & Co.; New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co.), is the title of Mr. Goldwin Smith's abstract of the four-volume Life of the "Liberator." He properly terms it a biographical essay, and this constitutes its prime distinction in the little library of such abstracts published in the past four years. It has been undertaken as a labor of love, but from an independent point of view, with freedom to interpret, judge, and approve or disapprove—moreover, with an essayist's discursiveness; the thread of the narrative being dropped *ad libitum* to philosophize, as in the chapter devoted to slavery, ancient and modern. If Garrison's non-resistance is a stumbling-block to the present as to many other reviewers, his persistence in keeping his agitation purely moral and non-political is justified, and the clerical apologists for slavery will find scant comfort in Mr. Smith's pages. His selections from the larger annals are mostly fresh and always pertinent, and perhaps none more characteristic of the reformer, writer, and orator could be brought together in such small compass. As a literary production, it is needless to say that this essay, which can easily be read at a sitting, has the charm of the author's well-known style. A trifling error may be pointed out on p. 15. It was not the Newburyport *Herald*, but the *Essex Courant*, that Garrison took over and transformed into the *Free Press*.

Bourget's 'Sensations d'Italie,' of which our French correspondent gave an account last October, comes to us from Cassell, done into English by Mrs. Serrano, and entitled, possibly in accordance with a suggestion of our correspondent's, '*Impressions* of Italy.' The same translator is also responsible for the English version of Señora Bazán's latest novel, 'The Angular Stone' (Cassell). Why such a rendering of 'La Piedra Angular' should have been adopted for the cover, while the phrase

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has been translated, the two or three times it occurs in the body of the book, into the less staggering English, "the corner-stone," we are at a loss to guess. The translation as a whole, while fairly adequate, betrays, in occasional slips and "angularities," the haste with which it was done.

Mr. John Robinson's 'Our Trees' (Salem Mass.: The Essex Institute) is a collection of sixteen letters which appeared in the Salem *Gazette* during the summer of 1891. The author says modestly that they were written for popular entertainment and instruction, and are not intended as botanical essays, and that he would not have them so considered by professional botanists. Neither did Thoreau write 'Walden' for professional botanists, and yet they can read both the writings of that philosopher and these letters of Mr. Robinson with interest and with profit. The letters are well written, and the constant reference to individual trees in the streets and gardens of Salem gives them a fine local coloring. His remark that "the fine row of sugar maples on Bridge Street, before the residence of Mr. Jas. P. Cook, have shown signs of failing within a few years, and it is quite probable that the sealing up of the roadway with block-pavement and the broad brick sidewalk prevent any considerable amount of moisture from reaching their roots," contains a hint which Superintendents of Streets generally would do well to consider. Mr. Robinson still refrains from telling the world just where in Essex County there still exists a swamp of the sweet-bay magnolia. Certainly all tree-lovers will thank him for his silence.

Prof. Walter Hempel, in addition to many other claims to recognition as a chemist of distinction, stands *facile princeps* on the very important subject of gas analysis. His treatise on 'Methods of Gas Analysis' has been translated from the second German edition by L. M. Dennis, and published by Macmillan. The scientific treatment of the subject began with Regnault in France and Bunsen in Germany. It has been developed by the labors of many chemists, and now presents a fairly complete special branch of analysis. Dr. Hempel divides his theme into a number of sections, and treats of each of them with perfect clearness. A large number of excellent woodcuts serve to make the various methods intelligible. Part i. deals with general, Part ii. with special methods; Part iii. with the practical applications of gas analysis. The work is very complete, and forms an extremely useful and valuable addition to the resources of the analyst. The translation is well executed, and had the advantage throughout of the personal coöperation of the author, who is himself familiar with the English language.

Just four years have elapsed since we noticed the apppearance of Part iii. of Toller's Bosworth's 'Anglo-Saxon Dictionary' (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan). The first section of Part iv. is now on our table, and carries on the vocabulary from Sár to Swídrian. We need not repeat our praise of this great improvement on the original work.

Prof. W. G. Hale's pamphlet on 'The *Cum*-constructions: their History and Functions' was issued four years ago, and, having gone abroad for scholarly recognition, now comes back in a German version by A. Neitzert (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner), and with a gracious preface by B. Delbrück—"ein paar Zeilen" of introduction to the German philological public. The volume is beautifully and most accurately printed.

The seventieth number of *Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte der Germanischen Völker* (Strassburg: Trübner) contains Dr. Emil Koeppel's studies in the history of the Italian novel in English literature of the sixteenth century, in which the author traces the sources of the plays of Shakspere and his contemporaries and the influence exerted upon them by Italian novels, their knowledge of which was derived chiefly from 'The Palace of Pleasure,' published in 1567–68 by William Painter, and recently reprinted in a sumptuous and expensive edition in England. Dr. Koeppel's "Studies" are only a preliminary survey of the field, but they are thoroughly scientific and in the right direction so far as they go. If for no other reason, they should be welcomed as a new departure in German Shakspere criticism from the elaborate and ingenious commentaries of Gervinus and the æsthetic-philosophical expositions of Kuno Fischer.

A fire in the printing-office of the *American Journal of Philology* has delayed for some weeks the appearance of the closing number of vol. xii. and perhaps also the first number of the new volume.

The *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* for January opens with a valuable article on Col. William Bradford's opposition to the landing of the tea in Philadelphia in 1773, by F. D. Stone. An etched portrait of the patriot printer and facsimiles of placards, etc., accompany the narrative. Mr. William S. Baker concludes his painstaking "Itinerary of Gen. Washington from June 15, 1775, to Dec. 23, 1783"; and now, we suppose, we may shortly look for it in a book.

Besides some "Recollections of Louisa May Alcott," profusely illustrated, a paper on "Harvard Clubs and Club Life," in which the *niaiseries* of D. K. E. are once more pictorially set forth, a more or less fresh instalment of "Negro Camp Melodies," and "Bryant's New England Home," attention will be drawn in the *New England Magazine* for March to Winfield S. Nevins's centenary "Stories of Salem Witchcraft." Many excellent views of houses, sites, and other antiquities are given in connection with the text.

Sun and Shade (N. Y. Photogravure Co.) for March is above the average in its collection of plates from nature and art. A capital portrait of Walt Whitman introduces the series.

The illustrated Italian fortnightly magazine *Natura ed Arte* (Milan: Francesco Vallardi) has improved steadily since its first number (the sixth is before us), and deserves to be examined by any reader of the Italian for pleasure. Each number has, besides many other embellishments, a photogravure portrait of some notability, as Verdi, Cialdini, Sardou, etc. In No. 5 the illustrious dead of 1891 are liberally pictured—George Bancroft among them; in No. 6, the leading actresses of the peninsula. Chronicles of news and finance, book and art reviews, and other standing departments, follow the entertaining papers which make up the body of the magazine.

In connection with the late historical exhibition illustrating the technical methods of the reproductive arts, with special reference to photo-mechanical processes, at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, a catalogue was issued which merits permanent preservation for its account of the several processes in question, with their infinite diversity of nomenclature.

In the annual summary of geographical literature given in the December issue of *Petermann's Mitteilungen*, it is interesting to note the falling off in the number of publications, which in 1891 was 773 less than in 1889, and 286 less than in 1890. The greatest decrease has been in those relating to Europe, which fell from 1,172 in 1889 to 176 last year. The whole number for the year was 2,189, of which Africa has nearly a quarter, Asia and America following with almost equal numbers. Whether these figures are the result of greater discrimination in the selection of publications to be noticed, or show a real decrease in interest in geographical subjects, it is difficult to determine.

An entirely new map of Persia appears in the February Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society, compiled under the supervision of Mr. George Curzon, M.P., and accompanied by a memorandum by him upon it together with a list of ninety-five maps used in its construction. Though nominally only of Persia, it includes all Beluchistan, the greater part of Afghanistan, and that part of Turkistan traversed by the Trans-Caspian Railway. Copies of the map, it may be added, with an index of places will be issued separately. The principal paper of the number is a discussion of the question, "Why are the prairies treeless?" by Mr. Miller Christy, F.L.S. After a brief statement of the theory that the lacustrine formation of the soil is the sufficient cause, he endeavors to show that the principal agent in bringing about the present condition is fire. Among other arguments he refers to the absence on the prairies of earthworms as well as of most species of mammals except burrowing ones. Following this is a summary, by Mr. D. W. Freshfield, of the explorations in the Central Caucasus in 1890, accompanied by a map.

—Mr. Howells takes leave, in *Harper's*, of the "Christmas Boy" and all the small images of outlandish literary gods which month by month he has put up in rows on the walls of the "Study," not without frank fear of what may now happen to these polyglot idols of his "modernity"; but he takes the wiser, and, as is his wont, the handsomer course, and attacks the besom of destruction with compliments instead of prayers. It is pleasant to find him ending with good words and not too serious a vein. Excess of seriousness, excess of emphasis, was possibly the bitter drop in the editor's amiability, which gave him the unhappy experience (to which he refers with a still lingering overstress) of finding that other men had opinions also regarding the old faiths of literary man and the new heresies of decadent or half-barbaric civilizations embodied in books. Reformers must, of course, be very earnest, especially in showing how different they are from other men; but, in fact, agreement with their neighbors in the main and fundamental matters is a vital condition of their success, and mankind is seldom far behind its leaders. For this reason Mr. Howells's fears are perhaps as exaggerated as were his hopes. His solicitude for the continuance of "Altruria," for instance, is wholly needless. "Altruria" was not his discovery. It was in all our geographies, and it will remain there so long as there are children to be taught what their parents possibly don't practise. His own experience in the attempt to erase the "Pays du Tendre" from the map should teach him that the cartography of the human heart is not made by critics though housed in "Studies." Similarly with that long tourney in which he has been engaged, with a vigor and persistence that even in the Arthurian Romance would seem incredible, during his five years' "foigning and traversing" with those who ride the lists on Sidney's and Shelley's side, there was never a time when he might not have heard the words that knights of old were wont to use—"Surely our quarrel is not so great but that we can leave fighting"; yet we fancy there is to be even now no real cessation, only a pause before the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new encounter is cried. But the pause gives occasion and opportunity for an expression of regard for faith, endurance, and purpose, though opposed; and finding, indeed, in the excellent customs of Romance none more binding than this "gentle courtesy," as it used to be called, and none more delightful in the exercise, we salute the "editor" as he retires from his familiar place, and wish him soon back in the field.

—The *Century* gives a prominent place to Paderewski, celebrating him with two portraits, a poem, some criticism, and a biography. This is full measure, and, if not pressed down, is certainly running over. But none of these things, we fancy, will at all take the place or give the quality of one of his notes; they can at most indicate to others how he has fluttered the metropolitan bosom. The illustration of the number is further enriched by some effective views of St. Paul's, three unrivalled cuts of Cole after Giorgione, and several altogether vivid representations of the life of the deep sea. The paper which accompanies these last is upon the work of the United States Fish Commission, and is a most interesting account of the history, voyages, methods, and "finds" of that useful branch of the public service. The first of Mr. E. C. Stedman's lectures on the "Nature and Elements of Poetry," which he gave at Johns Hopkins University and repeated this winter before Columbia, deals with definitions and does no more than open the subject. Towards the end of the number we come upon another fine portrait after Sargent, and also on a strong and resonant poem of Aldrich's, in which he gives a poet's praise to Swinburne for the latter's poetic qualities, and proclaims him the real poet-laureate to be, in the world's eyes, whatever false crownings may be attempted by royalty on the throne.

—Quite the most important poetical contribution, however, is the prize of *Scribner's*, which gives us the last verses of Lowell—a strongly framed and finely felt poem on Grant. Unfortunately it is in an unfinished state; though complete in structure, it is rough in surface, and there are more defects in it than the editor cared to point out in his note or indicate in the printing: the last line of the fourth stanza, for example, is not an Alexandrine. But such imperfections the reader will doubtless observe. A more important matter is the omission of the necessary comma (or even dash) after the word "primeval" in the fifth stanza, for the line as printed gives confusion to the first half of the stanza. The entire poem is in Lowell's most compact and condensed style, both in thought and construction, and needs all the subsidiary aid that can be given to it. The truthfulness of the portrait will be approved by all, and gives a striking sincerity to its praise; many of the lines are felicitous, both in phrase and style, and some will stick in the memory of the people. It is an addition to the patriotic verse of the country, and it is fitting that it should be the last work of his hand. In the remainder of the number we notice only the papers upon railway speed as of conspicuous interest.

—In the last report of the Treasurer of Harvard College, it is stated that the cost of conducting admission examinations in 1891 was nearly $1,500. The Treasurer of Yale College, in his report for the same year, records an expenditure of $1,504.24 for "examinations." These two universities are the chief defenders of the principle that the only safe way of determining the fitness of candidates for admission to college is by college extrance examinations, as distinguished from school graduation examinations. Why should the admission examination system be so costly? Harvard is now advertising that she will hold admission examinations this summer simultaneously in twenty-three different places, extending from Bonn on the East, to Tokio on the West, and including most of the leading cities and school centres of this country. Officers of the University are in most cases detailed to conduct these examinations, and in no instances are the question papers confided to the schoolmasters or to local committees. Both Yale and Harvard state in their catalogues that they are ready to conduct admission examinations at any point not within easy reach of existing examination places, provided a reasonable number of candidates apply for an examiner. It sometimes happens that examiners from Harvard, Yale, and Princeton meet candidates in the same building at the same hours, and conduct examinations which differ only in details, and which, theoretically, should be identical. Here is where the unnecessary element in the expenditures is found. We know no reason why these colleges (or their alumni) might not combine to maintain local boards to take charge of such examinations, and bear the burden of cost of services and rental. Such an economy would tend also to what is still more desirable, unification of examination papers.

—The most noteworthy piece of academic news that has been heard for some time is the creation in the Collège de France of a chair of General History of the Sciences, and the appointment thereto of M. Pierre Lafitte, the recognized chief of the French Positivists. Hitherto the philosophy of Comte has had no university standing in France, and it is to be noted that it is now rather as a science than as a philosophy or a religion that it comes into a high place. About all that Comte was willing to leave of the old philosophies was the history of them; his own teaching was meant to be rigidly scientific. His religion was, of course, quite another sort of thing, and this (although we believe that M. Pierre Lafitte personally holds to it) will not come within the scope of the new chair. All the rest of Positivism will fairly be included: the whole history of the rise of the sciences, and their passage through the three Comtian stages, theological, metaphysical, positive; their natural order, their coördination and subordination, and all their manifold relations with each other. The new professor will, then, have a wide field in which to abound *suo sensu*, and his work in it will be followed with much interested curiosity. It is almost exactly fifty years ago that Auguste Comte desired such a chair as this for himself. Guizot was then Minister of Public Instruction, and he was making many changes, and had given high places to such scholars as Ampère, Jouffroy, Eugène Burnouf, and Rossi. Comte, almost unknown, called upon the Minister and urged the founding of a professorship of the history of the mathematical and physical sciences. Guizot tells the story of their interview in a well-known passage in his 'Mémoires.' He could not in the least understand Comte, although, in order to do so, he condescended with all his might. He could hardly avoid, he says, expressing his astonishment that a clever man should be so limited in mind as not to see the bearing and relations of the facts he was handling, or that a man of moral sentiments —"moraux malgré lui"—should not perceive the immoral falseness of the ideas he was putting forward. "He wrote me a long letter a little while afterwards," Guizot goes on to say, "renewing his request for the creation of the chair which seemed to him indispensable for science and society. Had I thought fit to establish it, I should certainly never have dreamed for a moment of giving it to him."

RODWAY'S BRITISH GUIANA.

History of British Guiana, from the year 1668 to the present time. By James Rodway, F.L.S. Volume I. 1668–1781. Georgetown, Demerara: J. Thomson. 1891.

GUIANA is that vast country which lies between the great Rivers Orinoco and Amazon, in the northeastern portion of South America. This extensive region is shared by various nations, so that one may hear from time to time something of Venezuelan Guiana, British Guiana, Dutch Guiana, French Guiana, and Brazilian Guiana. Dutch Guiana is more familiar to us by the name of the principal part of it, Surinam. Few people are aware of the interesting fact that the colony of New York became an English colony practically in exchange for the colony of Surinam, under the provisions of the Treaty of Breda. It was agreed in that treaty that the English and Dutch were to retain what places they had conquered during the war, as they possessed and enjoyed them on the 10th of May, 1667. The English had captured the Dutch colony of New Netherlands, and the Dutch had taken the English colony of Surinam, and had retaken Essequibo and its dependencies, which had been captured by the English in 1665. It is true that New York was subsequently retaken by the Dutch and restored to the English, but, the fact remains, until that colony developed into a State, the original title by which it was held by Great Britain was identically the same as that by which the Dutch held their possessions in Essequibo as well as in Surinam.

The name of Cayenne, again, is more familiar than is that of French Guiana, the territory of which it forms but a part. Lying between Venezuela and Dutch Guiana is British Guiana. This colony is divided from the Dutch possessions by the broad waters of the River Corentyn. Great Britain and Venezuela dispute its boundary line to the northwest. The British dominion now comprises the three countries of Demerara, Berbice, and Essequibo, which take their names from three considerable rivers, and the northwestern district, which borders upon Venezuela. The name of Demerara is associated with a very high standard of sugar-making, so that "Demerara crystals" have come to be appreciated the wide world over. The El-Dorado of Sir Walter Raleigh had its airy abode somewhere in the region between the upper waters of the Essequibo and those of the Orinoco.

In his message to Congress on the 9th of December last, President Harrison referred to the dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela regarding the northwestern boundary of British Guiana, in these terms:

"I should have been glad to announce some favorable disposition of the boundary dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela, touching the western frontier of British Guiana, but the friendly efforts of the United States in that direction have thus far been unavailing. This Government will continue to express its concern at any appearance of foreign encroachment on territories long under the administrative control of American States. The determination of a disputed boundary is easily attainable by amicable arbitration, where the rights of the respective parties rest, as here, on historic facts, readily ascertainable."

The present is, therefore, a very fitting time

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the publication of a History of British Guiana. Such a work has been undertaken by Mr. James Rodway, the Librarian of the Royal Agricultural and Commercial Societies, and the author of 'Annals of Guiana.' It is being published by Mr. James Thomson, the proprietor of the *Argosy* Press, in Georgetown, the capital of British Guiana. Mr. Thomson has done yeoman's service to the cause of literature by his enterprise in publishing various works, mostly upon West Indian subjects, which, but for his courageous undertaking, might not have seen the light.

The first volume only of Mr. Rodway's History is published. This treats of the history of the colony from 1668 to 1781, when what is now British Guiana formed part of Dutch Guiana. The Dutch West India Company were the lords of the soil, but their authority was but slight in Berbice, where a tributary company (latterly of the Van Hoorns) held sway. Even in Demerara and Essequibo, the West India Company were far from absolute proprietors, for they were often troubled by the claims of the Zeelanders who were the first traders and settlers on the Wild Coast, as the Dutch called Guiana. Mr. Rodway has given an interesting account of the small beginnings from which has been developed the considerable possession now owned by Great Britain. Much of the information given by the author must have been collected by arduous labor alone, seeing that the sources of his narrative are mostly in the Dutch language.

It is pleasing to find how careful the Dutch authorities were to enjoin upon their officers that the native Indians should be kindly treated. A full account is given of the slave insurrection in Berbice, in 1763 and 1764. Persons interested in the colony will find in this volume the beginnings of the Government, of the Church, and of the various agricultural industries; the origin of land grants, of taxes upon land, and of taxation in general. The building of forts, and the first coming of lawyers and the provision of law books are touched upon. What is called the Legislative Council in other British colonies is, in British Guiana, called the Court of Policy, the Dutch name which has been continued. The origin of this body and of the Courts of Justice will be found in Mr. Rodway's book.

Americans will note with interest the restrictions placed by the Dutch upon the trade of New England with these colonies. The colonists needed horses and mules. To get them they had to relax the restrictions in 1752 so that if a vessel brought a certain number of animals in proportion to its tonnage, then she would be admitted. If the horses died during the voyage, their heads, salted, were to be produced as evidence of good faith. It was illegal to export sugar or cotton by such vessels, but molasses and rum might be shipped by them. Every New England vessel was bound to bring six animals, or their heads, failing which no vessel could enter. The North American ships brought the Dutchmen, besides animals, salt meat, fish, and flour. Before clearing, the captains had to affirm, on oath, that they had no sugar on board. Mr. Rodway says, however, that "there was very little money in Essequibo and Demerara, and, as may be supposed, the masters of the light New England schooners were not too scrupulous to slip past the fort in Essequibo, or the Brandwaght in Demerara, during the night, and load a few hogsheads of sugar." This shows that, after all, New Englanders were very much like other people. The shock of the American Revolution made its vibrations felt even among the Dutch colonists in South America. In March, 1777, the Dutch West Indian Company prohibited the colonial authorities from honoring the flag of the revolted British colonies. In the following month the exporting of ammunition to North America was prohibited. In the early part of 1781, when England and Holland were at war, two American privateers visited Demerara. On the 27th of February, in the same year, the colonies surrendered to English vessels of war. Notwithstanding this, two American vessels were in the Upper Demerara shortly afterwards. The English commander, on learning the fact, rated the Council, or Court of Policy, roundly for permitting the vessels to come there, and he threatened to report the matter to the Admiral, the famous Rodney; which, says Mr. Rodway, "made the Council very uncomfortable, although they excused themselves in the best way they could."

Although the volume before us does not treat of the boundary dispute, it may not be amiss to refer to certain public facts within the power of every one to investigate. As has already been stated above, the Treaty of Breda, in 1667, arranged that the English and Dutch should retain their respective acquisitions. Now, in 1665, the English had possessed themselves of the Dutch settlements in Essequibo, which were subsequently retaken by the Dutch. By the Treaty of Breda, therefore, the Dutch held their possessions by as good a title as the English held New York. The commander of the English forces which captured the settlements in Essequibo subsequently wrote an account of Guiana, which is preserved in manuscript in the British Museum (Sloane MSS. 3662). In this account of Guiana, written, be it remembered, after the English had been turned out by the Dutch, the writer says respecting the year 1665:

"This yeare the English could boast of the possession of all that part of Guiana abutting on the Atlantick Ocean, from Cayan on the South-East to Oronoque on the north-west (except a small Colonie in the River Berbishes), which is no lesse than six hundred English miles."

From this it is clear that, so far back as 1665, the English regarded the Orinoco as the boundary of the Dutch possessions on the coast of Guiana. The British, however, do not claim quite so far as this. They claim that the Amacura, a small stream next door to the Orinoco, is the dividing line on the coast. This is the division which is known as the *Schomburgk* line. Any one who would approach the boundary question with impartiality, may easily learn that the Amacura was regarded as the boundary long before Sir Robert Schomburgk was born or the Venezuelan Republic came into existence. Old charts show this over and over again. Take, for example, the map of South America by D'Anville and Bolton, published in 1755; that gives the Amacura as the boundary.

Now, having shown above that the Orinoco was regarded as the line of division in 1665, let us inquire what was considered to be the boundary in 1781, the year with which Mr. Rodway's first volume ends. In 1781 the colonies again fell into the hands of the English. In 1782 the French took them from the English. In 1783 the French restored them to the Dutch. When the colonies were in possession of the English in 1781, they were for a time governed by Capt. Thompson, the commander of a ship of war called the *Hyœna*. In 1783, when the Dutch were again in possession, De la Rochelle published a chart of the coast of Guiana, from the Orinoco to the Amazon. In this chart the line of division is given at the Barima, the river which, after the Amacura, comes next to the Orinoco. While, however, putting the Barima where he should have put the Amacura, he has at the same time put the Amacura where the Barima ought to be—that is, within the Dutch area. This mistake is made by at least one other cartographer of the period. In either case it goes to show that the Dutch dominion extended to the Amacura.

It is, further, proper to distinguish carefully between mere shadowy claims and substantial rights of occupation and dominion. The Venezuelans claim that their boundary extends to the left bank of the Essequibo, where Dutchmen and Englishmen have for generations been born and buried. This, too, in despite of the fact that when the English were again in possession of the colonies, in 1797, a Spanish force was sent across from the left side of the Orinoco—the right bank being but little inhabited, and then only high up the river—to attack a part of the Essequibo coast known as Capoey, with the result that the Spanish force was there and then annihilated by Dutch troops which had consented to remain in the colony in the service of the English Government. The records of the colonial Legislature show that a pension was awarded to the children of Capt. Rochelle, who commanded the victorious Dutch soldiers, and who died from his wounds.

When President Harrison alluded to "encroachment on territories long under the administrative control of American States," he could hardly have referred to the northwestern territory of British Guiana. British subjects are settled within that territory, not Venezuelans. But what is the fact as regards the Venezuelan side of the Amacura? Just this, that about six years ago the Venezuelan Government appointed a commissary for this then desolate district, and, for want of inhabitants of its own, conferred the office upon a British subject named Robert Wells, who had gone over from British Guiana. For some time Don Roberto Wells, in a thatched shanty, and his family, were the representatives of Venezuelan population in the grandiloquently styled Manoa district. So far is this district from being peopled that at the present time a Venezuelan official is doing his utmost to induce persons living in Georgetown, the capital of British Guiana, and others in the country districts, to come and settle on the Venezuelan side of the Amacura. So great are the inducements offered that it is very likely a measure of success will attend this scheme of peopling a desolate region in Venezuela with settlers brought from British Guiana. There is something comical in such a procedure, especially when it is remembered that Great Britain is charged with making encroachments upon Venezuela.

The historical connection between Dutch and British dominion over the Dutch colonies now comprised in British Guiana can be very shortly stated. In 1796, the colonies surrendered to the British, who kept them until 1802, when, by the Treaty of Amiens, they were restored to the Dutch. In 1803 they were again surrendered to a British force. Finally, in 1814, they were ceded to Great Britain, in whose hands they have remained.

BUTLER'S BOOK.

Butler's Book. By Benj. F. Butler. A review of his legal, political, and military career. Illustrated with 125 engravings, maps, photogravures, etc. Boston: A. M. Thayer & Co. 8vo, pp. 1,154.

EXPECTED sensations are commonly disap-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pointments. They turn out to be much less thrilling than the hints and announcements led us to believe. Butler's book is no exception to the rule. It is probably less trenchant than it would have been if he had written it earlier. The position of certain great figures in the war-epoch has become so fixed that there is less temptation to hurtle against them. Those who remember the *on dits* of '65 can read between the lines the traces of griefs in regard to Lincoln, Grant, and Stanton, which have been almost though not quite obliterated in the lapse of nearly thirty years. Part of this is due to prudence, part, no doubt, to the softening effect of time and reflection, for even Butler shows occasionally a gleam of geniality and an old man's tendency to think kindly of the antagonists of his earlier life. The instances are not frequent enough to prove that he has lapsed into charity towards all mankind, for among those who could be said to come into rivalry or collision with him, few enough are they who escape the knife that has been long whetted for them. On this point, indeed, he avows his unrepentance, and insists that the "hard words" which he so freely uses "are the only ones which ought to be used."

The casual reader who has himself no personal recollection of the public events with which Butler deals, would be likely to find his first feeling, on reading the book, one of amazement that the country should not have thrown itself bodily into the hands of the consummate statesman and hero who alone of all his compatriots knew exactly what should be done in every crisis. But as he goes on, he discovers a cumulation of little slips which, though of no consequence separately, beget a growing uneasiness, and a diminishing faith in the omniscience he was disposed to rely on with comfortable assurance. Butler has exhibited his triumphs at every step, from the common school to the leadership of armies and the government of States; yet each victory—dare we say it?—rings a little false. Each sample of the harvest of honors shows, as Tennyson says, some "little pitted speck in garnered fruit."

In his schoolboy class in parsing, he was sent to the head for construing a couplet from Pope, though we have a torturing doubt that if the master had been more familiar with the poet's diction, he might have remained at the foot. As a geography exercise, he compares the relation between Washington and Annapolis to that between Paris and Havre. The "thirty odd miles" between our capital and the Chesapeake he finds "about the same distance" as between Paris and the port at the mouth of the Seine, though the maps have a queer way of making the latter, say, five times as great a distance, as the crow flies, or ten times as great if we follow the actual navigation of the river. In military history he makes a point of what Napoleon "told his men at Saragossa, when they were falling around him," while hitherto historians have omitted to record the presence of the Emperor at either of the two sieges of Saragossa which occurred in the Spanish war; though the opening words of his Majesty's remarks, "Never mind, boys!" might still be apposite.

In navigation Gen. Butler surely is strong, for no Essex County man could be otherwise than familiar with Bowditch. Yet, to our mystification, the ancient mariner now in command of the *America* tells a strange sea tale of his transport ship getting on the Frying-pan near Cape Hatteras. It looked for a time as if they were likely to get out of the Frying-pan into the fire of the rebels at Fort Macon, but the seamanship of Gen. Butler saved them. The ship, "drawing eighteen feet of water," ran upon the sandy shoal. The captain was a traitor or an imbecile. Butler assumed command, and ordered him to "get your deep-sea lead and come forward with me!" So the captain shouldered the hundred-weight of metal and ten-score fathoms of line and went forward. We put behind us the question what need of sounding, since they had the land aboard at a draft of eighteen feet. But why the deep-sea lead? The lightest of hand-leads, nay, a fishing-line and a sinker, might have sufficed. We admonish the doubting reader that though the Corinthians of Marblehead indulge in irreverent mirth, there lies therein a mystery of the deep sea.

In the politics of the country in the period before the war, who could be at home if not he who was a member of every Democratic Presidential Convention and had an active hand in every phase of his party's conflicts in Massachusetts? Butler tells us he was prominent in the coalition made between the Free-Soilers and Democrats in that State in 1849. He speaks, therefore, as one having authority when he defines the position of parties at that time. "The proposition of the Free-Soil party," he says, "as enunciated by Mr. William Lloyd Garrison, one of its leaders at that time, was that the Constitution was a covenant with hell and a league with death." This proves how much stranger truth is than fiction, and how the most curious inversions of fact have long passed current as the most solid of verities. The Free-Soil party actually pretended to revere the Constitution and to limit their anti-slavery purposes to the Territories, over which that Constitution gave full control. The hypocrites! And the good Butler was making a league and covenant with them at the time, for the purpose of dividing the offices.

Scarcely less novel and startling is the light he throws on the party struggles of 1860. He tells us he voted for Jefferson Davis in the Charleston Convention, "with intent to preserve the Union and ward off that very secession which Greeley long afterwards justified, advised, and did all that he could to incite." After reading this, one instinctively glances ahead to see whether the next paragraph will not reveal Stanton as the *de facto* Confederate Secretary of War. He does not say this, but, what is almost as interesting, he tells us that he himself left the Douglas Convention at Baltimore and went with the Breckinridge men, for one reason, "because I would no longer sit in a convention where the reopening of the African slave trade, made piracy by every law of God and man, was advocated and applauded." The epoch-making character of the book is sufficiently attested by these revelations. Comment could add nothing to their significance.

Next in value to the nuggets of pure gold in the form of hitherto unknown facts in history, are the characterizations of leading men with whom the author was in more or less intimate contact. Lincoln we learn to know as a good, easy man, fairly able to see a point when a competent mentor at his elbow instructs him with proper painstaking; but as soon as Butler is gone, he falls from grace and does "the evil he would not." Often acknowledging Butler's military and civil genius, he is led by designing men to remove from successive important commands him who should have been his mainstay. Stanton, also, is credited with good intentions, but is a warning example of the dangers of slipping into the place which is proverbially paved with them. Whether he did most to baffle the bad purposes of Butler's (and the country's) enemies, or they did most in making use of him to wrong the great man, is left an open question. Seward, "the man Seward," appears often on the scene as a Mephistopheles thwarting the patriotic purposes of the good man and the hero. He is "weak-kneed," one who "would instantly deny" the truth, intending "to aid the French Emperor in his attack on Mexico," sending "that secession spy and agent, Reverdy Johnson, to New Orleans" to help France, making a "cowardly and unjust administration of the State Department." All this is the more curious inasmuch as Napoleon III., Maximilian, and Marshal Bazaine all thought that Seward had defeated and ruined them. Chase is exposed in trying to corrupt the incorruptible Butler by sending to him one "who at the time controlled the means of enabling men to make fortunes greater in number and larger in amount than any other Treasury official has ever held." It seems that Lincoln and Chase each wanted Butler to be candidate for Vice-President on his ticket. Welles was a Secretary of the Navy "who thought cowardice excusable," and who was hoodwinked by the officers of the blockading squadrons, who discriminated in catching blockade-runners, preferring to let them run in and catch them running out, as prize-money was increased thereby.

Senator Wilson of Massachusetts appears to be a small, inconstant man, "afraid of Andrew," the Governor, and, through unworthy jealousy, defeating a bill to give Butler one of Twiggs's swords, by putting it "in one of his pigeon-holes, where it has ever since slept the sleep that knows no waking." Senator Sumner, in the matter of enlistments for the New Orleans expedition, "did everything he could to disturb me and to serve Andrew. Sumner had plenty of leisure for this sort of thing. Although he was in the Senate for more than a quarter of a century, ten lines of laws upon the statute books of the United States drawn by him are yet to be found." As for Governor Andrew, "he had the good quality of cultivating malignity as a parlor-plant." More is said of him, but what need of more?

If we turn to the military men in despair at finding civil affairs in the hands of the wicked, the revelations are not more reassuring. Winfield Scott is shown to have treated Butler with "studied unjust treatment," "as he has always treated those whom he knew would be effective if he gave them the means, retaining everything in his own power and under his own immediate control, so as to monopolize all the reputation to be made." This last quotation is from a letter to Butler which he adopts, and it has therefore the authority of the great man himself. He had bearded Scott in his den, had told him he "did not know what he was writing about," nor, in fact, anything else; he had repudiated Scott's authority, and had bowed himself out with a "Good-morning, General," without giving the old General-in-Chief the opportunity to slip in a word of reply edgeways. Who before had ever done this and escaped the bilboes? Yet the heaven-born to command did it, and Scott cooed him as gently as any sucking dove in the next interview, congratulating him on his assignment to Fortress Monroe, where "hog-fish have just come in." McClellan was made to hasten the expedition to the Mississippi by Butler's intimating that otherwise Lincoln would do violence to his modesty by putting him in command of the Army of the Potomac. Halleck he found to be his arch-enemy, and depicts his wickedness in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many passages full of "hard words," summing it up at last by saying, "to speak plainly," he was a "lying, treacherous, hypocritical scoundrel, with no moral sense."

The author's treatment of Grant deserves a fuller study and analysis than one brief paper can give. It would be easy to miss the subtle irony under the guise of hearty praise. As to military matters, it must suffice to say that, in the campaign on the James, Butler fulfilled his task and had done all that he agreed to do. Grant had done nothing that was planned, and the despatches from his headquarters were "in every substantial particular misleading and untrue." In the matter of the exchange of prisoners, he tells us that the lives of those who died "from cold, starvation, and pestilence in the prison pens" of the South, "were spent as a part of the system of attack upon the rebellion, devised by the wisdom of the general-in-chief of the armies to destroy it by depletion." He thinks "the loyal mourners" will "appreciate all the more highly the genius which conceived the plan."

The military men of less rank who, instigated by the devil, disobeyed or thwarted our hero, are flagellated without mercy. *Inter arma* mercy is silent. From Col. Lefferts and the Seventh New York at Annapolis in 1861, to Admiral Porter at Fort Fisher in December, 1864, no guilty one is allowed to escape. They are hanged, drawn, and quartered as a terror to like evil-doers in the future, that the path of the Butler of the next war may be made easier. Of these, however, Gens. Gillmore and W. F. Smith and Admiral Porter are *facile principes*, unless Halleck should be admitted to rivalry. The epithets explode as fast as the bombs from the mortar-boats in the Mississippi, and Butler assures us that they do greater execution. "Cowardice," "mendacity," "falsifier," "dastard," "villanous," "ridiculous in his cowardice as he was false in his statements," "reckless, consciousless [*sic*] and impudent liar," fly about in a way to bewilder the enemy; and last, and worse even than malodorous Chinese missile, he flings into a bomb-proof casemate a "MEPHITIS AMERICANA" in upper case! Of course the garrison must surrender at discretion.

What has been said may put the reader sufficiently in the personal point of view of the author to enable him to estimate, in some measure, the true value of the graver historical matters to be found in the pages of the book. It would be preposterous, within our limits, to attempt to deal with the tithe of them. An equal volume would be required. It is only due to such a statesman and hero, however, to put him on his guard against some of the plots to weaken his influence. He has shown that there was deep mining in the War Office in Halleck's time; but even he is not wholly aware how deep. Foreseeing, or perhaps foreordaining, the charge that he was then seeking one of the vacant major-generalships in the regular army, "which," as he says, "I never thought of or desired," his enemy has embodied in the Official Records, now published, a pretended letter to Lincoln, dated May 17, 1864, in which he is made to say: "Do you think I have done enough to entitle me to one of the vacant commissions in the army, to date from May 16, 1861?" Lincoln is made to answer on the next day, "As to the major-generalships in the regular army, I think I shall not dispose of another; at least, until the combined operations now in progress under the direction of Gen. Grant, and within which yourself and command are included, shall be terminated." Gen. Butler should, in justice to himself, see that these wicked interpolations are excluded, if the whole edition of the Records has to be recalled. Such a commission, dating from May, 1861, would have outranked Sherman, Sheridan, and Meade.

In his later political lucubrations there is also evidence of a mischievous hand at work, seeking to bring him into contempt. The plot may not go beyond the composing-room of his publishers, but it needs looking after. He is made to say that the authorized issue of the five-twenty bonds, in 1867, was "fifteen thousand millions." If figures had been used, they would hardly need to be noticed, but the words are spelt out in full. So he is made to talk wisely of "terminal annuities" in several places, and "courtileges" and the like. It may be well to watch even the printers. Some of them might be weak enough to think that nothing could be more nonsensical than his financial oration on fiat money, and may have amused themselves with adding to the jumble.

The Silva of North America. By Charles S. Sargent. Vol. III. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

THIS volume contains fifty plates illustrating six species of *Anacardiaceæ* and thirty of *Leguminosæ*. The *Anacardiaceæ* are—*Cotinus Americanus*, a close congener of the well-known smoke-tree, or Venetian sumach; two of our common sumachs, *Rhus typhina* and *R. copallina;* the poisonous *R. Vernix*, or, as it has usually been named, *R. venenata;* the Floridian *R. Metopium*, nearly as poisonous, and the Californian *R. integrifolia*, locally called mahogany. The separation of *Cotinus* from *Rhus* seems to be based mainly on its production of the barren feathery pedicels which give its flower clusters the smoky look—a character which most systematists have not thought of generic importance, and which Bentham and Hooker have not even mentioned. *Cotinus* was proposed by Tournefort, and, though at first recognized by Linnæus, was later disregarded by him. In reviving it, Prof. Sargent has occasion to indulge in one of the vagaries of the modern school of priority-worshippers by using the double name of *Cotinus Cotinus* for the smoke-tree—a usage which finds its only parallel in such personal names as Cholmondeley-Cholmondeley or Jenkins-Jenkins. In the Northeastern States *Rhus glabra* is more nearly a tree than *R. copallina*, and would therefore seem better entitled to a place in this Silva, but, further south, the latter appears to attain a greater size, and to assume the true arboreal dignity.

Of the thirty trees here described which belong to the great order *Leguminosæ* (the pod-bearers), only one, *Gymnocladus dioicus*, the Kentucky coffee-tree, is native as far north as New York, having been found wild about some of the lakes in the central part of the State; but several other kinds have been long cultivated in the North and East—*Robinia Pseudacacia* and *R. viscosa*, the "locusts," *Gleditschia triacanthos*, the three-thorned acaci or honey-locust, *Cladrastis lutea*, the yellow-wood, often known as Virgilia, and the Judas-tree (*Cercis Canadensis*). The greater locust is indeed so abundant on Long Island as to be used for posts, fuel, etc., and has much the appearance of a native. Prof. Sargent suggests that it was often planted by the Indians for the sake of its elastic wood, one of the best for bows. He quotes from Catesby (*anno* 1763) the statement that the English in Virginia, "being obliged to run up with all the expedition possible such little houses as might serve them to dwell in, till they could find leisure to build larger and more convenient ones, they erected each of their little hovels on four only of these trees, pitched into the ground to support the four corners: many of these posts are yet standing, and not only the parts under ground, but likewise those above, are still perfectly sound." Large locusts and still larger honey-locusts are very common in New York and in the southern parts of New England, and, with their feathery foliage, often make a most graceful feature in the landscape.

The other twenty-five trees of this volume are Southern or Western. Perhaps the most interesting among them is the mesquite (*Prosopis juliflora*) of the far Southwest. It is a shrub, or at best a tree thirty or forty feet high, having feathery foliage like a locust, and bearing an abundant crop of long, somewhat jointed pods filled with a sweet spongy pulp. The Spanish settlers found the natives using these pods for food, and so they gave to the tree their own name (*Algarrobo*), for the old-world tree which produces the flat, blackish, edible pods commonly called St. John's bread. This name is evidently Arabic, *El karob*. Supposing the tree to be of an unnamed genus, Torrey and Gray called it *Algarobia glandulosa*. But De Candolle had already described it as *Prosopis juliflora* from specimens sent from Jamaica, whither it had been carried from the continent. The wood is heavy and hard and of a rich color: it is much used for parts of wagon-wheels, for furniture, sometimes for pavements, and is an excellent fuel. Moreover, the tree yields a gum much like gum arabic.

Mr. Faxon's drawings are as good as in the earlier volumes, and Prof. Sargent's descriptions and notes are rich and instructive. It is a great pity that he is under the influence of a perverse school of nomenclature. An instance of this unfortunate perversity in the present volume is the spelling *Gleditsia* for *Gleditschia*. *Gleditsia* is the original spelling of Linnæus, but as the genus was named in honor of *Gleditsch*, nearly all botanists have preferred the reformed orthography.

Mark Hopkins. By Franklin Carter, President of Williams College. [American Religious Leaders.] Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

IN length of identification with a single college, Dr. Hopkins's career was, and probably will remain, unique in American educational history: sixty-six years as student, tutor, professor, and president did he stand in his place in the Berkshire institution which he loved and served with all his strength. The college catalogue shows many a case of father and son sitting under his instruction, and might easily show, perhaps does show, a case of father, son, and grandson. For a generation his fame as a teacher was the riches of the college, long poor in buildings and equipment, and drew men, if not money, from all over the country. His success was that of a large and original nature. He was not a scholar, even according to the standard of fifty years ago. Most of his classes have heard from his own lips the naïve confession of his early but fruitless attempts to get a knowledge of German philosophy through English translations. He turned to books not for the material, but for the illustration and confirmation, of his native thought. His power as a teacher was that of stimulus, not information, and none of the long succession of his classes, down to the one he taught at eighty-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

five, failed to catch the glow and enthusiasm of his ever youthful ardor. Nothing delighted him more than the gleam of mental awakening in his students, and away would go text-book and lecture that he might, with Socrates, "follow the argument." To the very end he made the impression of perfect frankness and zest for the truth as such, so that it could have been said of him, as it was said of Lewes by George Eliot, that he would stop short in the rush of an argument to admit that he was wrong—only, it was ordinarily the other disputant who had to do the admitting.

The first impression made by President Carter's biography is that it is surprisingly barren—that is, that it gives so little to mark and explain the becoming of this masterful man. We get meagre but perhaps sufficient details of his ancestry, which was right Puritan on both sides; but of his boyhood and youth, only a faint legend or two, of his student life little more than faded reminiscences. It is not even known whether a year of school-teaching which he did was spent in Massachusetts or Virginia. The biographer does not appear to be blameworthy for this disappointing vagueness and meagreness as respects Dr. Hopkins's early years. He lived to so great an age that it is now impossible to recover any memorials of his youth from his survivors; and diaries and letters, if there were any, all have vanished. Not even from his numerous children or his widow can anything be obtained to light up those blank years. We can only note this as a great misfortune, though in itself highly illustrative of the personal reserve which marked the man. He may have taken warning by the dreadful example of his brother Albert's published diaries and letters, and destroyed anything of the kind he himself had preserved.

For the too lifeless record of his prime and later years here given us, we cannot, however, free President Carter from the responsibility. It is not material, but judicious handling, that is lacking for that period. No critical analyses of Dr. Hopkins's various books, no formal estimates of him as "The Teacher," "The Administrator," "The Theologian"—analyses and estimates more in the tone of an article than a biography—can make good the absence of the man himself. One chapter is an exception—that entitled "The Friend." It consists of letters written by Dr. Hopkins to Ray Palmer in the course of twenty-five years. They are worth more than all the rest of the book, for in them the nature of the man is self-declared. Elsewhere the human touches are few, and in place of the man we are shown an idealized figure suited to a commemorative sermon. This cannot but prove disappointing to those who have come into contact with Dr. Hopkins's large humanity, and who look to this book for an adequate presentation of it. They will recall his immense native shrewdness, sharpened by long study of the genus college-student into something which was often very like guile, and will see with regret that this quality, with many others equally human, is almost entirely sublimed out of him in President Carter's pages. These give the go-by to many sides and aspects of his personality which a single glance at his portrait of about 1850 is enough to suggest. As a record of his external life—of the public positions he held and declined, the books and lectures with which he blazed his way, his religious and charitable activities, and the vicissitudes of Williams College during the years he knew it—nothing more could be asked; but as a biography it is certain to come to many as a pallid and etherialized representation of a thoroughly human personality.

General View of the Political History of Europe. By Ernest Lavisse, Professor at the Sorbonne. Translated by Charles Gross, Ph.D., of Harvard University. Longmans, Green & Co.

THIS is an admirable little book, and Dr. Gross, in selecting and translating it, has rendered good service to historical education. M. Lavisse, who is known by his recent work on the history of Prussia, brings to the difficult task here achieved accurate knowledge combined with a fine sense of proportion and value, and much skill in tracing the movements of great currents under the criss-cross play of local and momentary surface commotion. He writes for the most part quite simply and clearly, with a truly conversational ease, so that the reader comes to think the writing of philosophical history the easiest thing in the world; yet if any one will try to express in no more pages than suffice for M. Lavisse the nature of the Roman Empire, or the rise of Christianity, or the growth of Prussian power or French nationality, he may not be readily satisfied with the result. With all its ease the style has a nervous suggestiveness provocative of thought, so that the book is one of those that repay a second reading better than the first, and a third better than the second. If Prof. Lavisse lectures thus, his hearers must be accounted fortunate.

The author finds the interest of history to lie in watching the action of human nature in the gross, with its capacity for modification and its inherent unchangeableness, its practicality and its love of the ideal, in contest with geographical and ethnographical conditions, with the ever-growing pressure of greater numbers and new political entities, with the influence of an ever-growing past of experience and thought. The resultant is the development of nations out of races, and the appearance of conscious national individuality, self-centred and self-assertive. He closes the book with a balancing of causes that make for peace and for war, and his prognostications will seem to some readers too gloomy. We incline to admit their force as regards the immediate future, but the removal of the time-limit would probably bring some forces into the field which M. Lavisse has not here considered. The author claims, justly, we think, a reasonable, but not a denationalized impartiality, nor would we ask for more. Allowance can be made for perspective when the standpoint is known; it is the observer who has cut loose from earth who is dangerous.

Finally, it should be noted that this book is not an epitome of history; it gives few dates and but little narrative. It is a digestive to aid the assimilation of facts, and should be taken after, not before, a course of history as ordinarily written. One of its best uses will be in the hands of teachers who are leading classes through the common text-books of European history. The translation adheres closely to the original, which it represents in style as well as in meaning.

The Original Mother Goose's Melody, as issued by John Newbery of London, *circa* 1760; Isaiah Thomas of Worcester, Mass., *circa* 1785; and Munroe & Francis of Boston, *circa* 1825. Reproduced in facsimile, from the first Worcester edition, with introductory notes by William H. Whitmore, etc., etc. Boston: Damrell & Upham. 1892.

THIS bibliography already furnishes material itself to bibliography. We have before us first the Thomas facsimile alone (Albany: Munsell, 1889); next, the facsimile with Mr. Whitmore's introductory notes (same publisher and date); and now this cloth-bound work of 117 pages, enlarged by the 'Fairy Tales of Mother Goose' translated from Perrault by R. Samber, as found in the New York edition of 1795, together with a sketch of Perrault's life by Mr. Whitmore. If more is to come, it ought to be from English and French antiquarians incited by this industrious American example.

His researches during the past three years have necessitated comparatively little change in Mr. Whitmore's notes to the 'Melody.' He has discovered in the Boston *News-Letter* of 1739 evidence that Puritan children then counted among their recreations "The House that Jack Built"—accounted "a vulgar [*i. e.*, familiar] Play Song." He can also point to American reprints *à la* Newbery in 1768 and 1771, but not bearing the name of Mother Goose. He has come upon an English book of 1808 giving the name of "Mother Goose's Tales" to Perrault's collection. Of Thomas's edition of the 'Melody' he now knows a third edition, and produces a facsimile of the title-page with other particulars. From this date, 1799, there are no examples till the Munroe & Francis edition of 1825. Mr. Whitmore concludes this topic with a complete refutation of the "absurd claim" that the original Mother Goose was a Bostonian, "Mrs. Vergoose or Goose."

Next comes the 'Tales of Passed Times by Mother Goose, with Morals. Written in French by M. Perrault, and Englished by R. S. Gent. . . . The Seventh Edition, Corrected, and Adorned with fine Cuts. New-York: Printed for J. Rivington, Bookseller and Stationer, No. 56, Pearl-Street. 1795.' Mr. Whitmore identifies "R. S., gentleman," with Robert Samber, a hack writer of the second quarter of the eighteenth century, who did his work in this instance very well, if we may judge from Mr. Whitmore's annotations, following the French, for he has no errors to point out. Under "Little Thumb" he remarks that he cannot tell when the change to Tom Thumb ("an old personage in English nursery literature") took place, but leaves it to be inferred that it was possibly after 1808. Under "Riquet with the Tuft," he observes: "It is a coincidence that M. Riquet figures in Perrault's autobiography as an engineer whose ignorance he exposed on an important occasion."

The brief memoir of Perrault is entertainingly written from the rather meagre sources. He was a member of the French Academy, filling the twenty-third seat, in which he was succeeded by Gaston, Cardinal de Rohan, and which is now occupied by M. Mézières. From him dates the custom of public receptions at the Academy, with the new member's eulogy of his predecessor; and the practice of choice by ballot. He maintained the superiority of modern over ancient authors in a famous controversy. Perrault's 'Contes de ma mère l'Oye' have done more to make him remembered than his two splendid folio volumes of portraits, 'Les Hommes Illustres qui ont paru en France pendant ce siècle' (1696, 1700), from which Mr. Whitmore has transferred the frontispiece portrait of the author to the corresponding place in the present volume. Among other embellishments pertaining to the same person, we should mention the frontispiece of Perrault's rare first edition of the 'Contes,' and a curious engraving illustrating the taking of the French Academy under Louis XIV.'s protection, in which the Immortals are grouped on inscribed leaves of a laurel wreath cut by medallions of the former protectors, Richelieu and Séguier.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This entertaining monograph, which we could describe thoroughly only by repeating what we have said regarding the previous editions, is of course mainly for adult readers; but Mr. Whitmore recommends substituting the Samber version of the prose tales for the later forms now current.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Ask Mamma. [The "Jorrocks" Edition.] Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co. $2.25.
Ayer, Harriet H. My Lady's Dressing Room. Cassell. $1.50.
Ballou, M. M. Equatorial America. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.50.
Bazán, Emilia P. The Angular Stone. Cassell. 50 cents.
Bendall, H., and Laurence, C. E. Graduated Passages for First-Sight Translation. Part II. Moderately Easy. Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan.
Bourget, Paul. Impressions of Italy. Cassell. $1.50.
Caine, Hall. The Scapegoat. U. S. Book Co. 50 cents.
Cassell's Complete Pocket Guide to Europe. Revised and enlarged. Cassell. $1.50.
Craig, Mrs. Alethe L. Women of the World, with a Search Light of Epigram. Baltimore: H. W. Diek & Co. $1.
Crawford, F. M. Zoroaster. Macmillan. $1.
Dargenty, G. Antoine Watteau. [Les Artistes Célèbres.] New York: Macmillan.
Day, L. F. Nature in Ornament. London: B. T. Batsford; New York: Scribners. $4.50.
De Rousiers, Paul. American Life. Dyrsen & Pfeiffer.
De Vogüé, E. M. Regards Historiques et Littéraires. Paris: Armand Colin & Cie.
Dickinson, Evelyn. A Vicar's Wife. London: Methuen & Co.
Ellinwood, Rev. F. F. Oriental Religions and Christianity. Scribners. $1.75.
Fowler, W. W. Julius Cæsar and the Foundation of the Roman Imperial System. Putnams. $1.50.
Gardiner, S. R. A Student's History of England from the Earliest Times to 1885. Longmans, Green & Co.
Goodyear, W. H. The Grammar of the Lotus. Dodd, Mead & Co. $15.
Gummere, Prof. F. B. Germanic Origins: A Study in Primitive Culture. Scribners. $2.
Hanslick, Prof. Eduard. The Beautiful in Music. London and New York: Novello, Ewer & Co.
Harper, C. G. English Pen Artists of To-Day. Macmillan. $20.
Hatton, Joseph. The Princess Mazaroff; a Romance of the Day. John W. Lovell Co. $1.
Hervey, M. H. The Trade Policy of Imperial Federation. London: Sonnenschein; New York: Scribners. $1.
Horine, Rev. M. C. Practical Reflections on the Book of Ruth. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society. 50 cents.
Kip, Rev. W. I. The Early Days of My Episcopate. Whittaker. $1.50.
Ludlow, Rev. J. M. That Angelic Woman. Harpers.
Malot, Hector. Conscience. Worthington Co.
Peacock, T. L. Maid Marian. London: J. M. Dent & Co.; New York: Macmillan. $1.
Pike, G. H. Charles Haddon Spurgeon. Funk & Wagnalls Co. $1.
Rollins, G. W. Erckmann-Chatrian's Madame Thérèse. Boston: Ginn & Co. 70 cents.
Sinnett, A. P. The Rationale of Mesmerism. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.25.
Thein, Rev. John. Christian Anthropology. Cincinnati: Benziger Bros. $2.50.
Theuriet, A. Jules Bastien-Lepage and his Art. Macmillan. $3.50.
The Tarot of the Bohemians. London: Chapman & Hall; New York: Scribners. $3.
Thompson, Maurice. Poems. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.50.
Toller, Prof. T. N. An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary. Part IV., Section I. Sár—Swidrian. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. $2.
Trent, W. P. William Gilmore Simms. [American Men of Letters.] Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.25.
Valabrègue, Antony. Abraham Bosse. [Les Artistes Célèbres.] New York: Macmillan.
Verity, A. W. Milton's Samson Agonistes. Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan.
Verity, J. B. Electricity up to Date. F. Warne & Co.
Walkley, A. B. Playhouse Impressions. London: T. Fisher Unwin; New York: Scribners. $1.50.
Ward, Mrs. Humphry. The History of David Grieve. 2 vols. Macmillan. $3.
Warren, Cornelia. Miss Wilton. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.25.
Whitney, Prof. W. D. Max Müller and the Science of Language. Appletons.
Whiton-Stone, Cara G. Sonnets, Songs, Laments. Boston: J. G. Cupples. $1.25.
Wilkins, Mary E. The Pot of Gold, and Other Stories. Boston: D. Lothrop Co. $1.50.
Wilkins, W. H. The Alien Invasion. London: Methuen & Co.
Wilkinson, J. F. Pensions and Pauperism. London: Methuen & Co.
Woolley, Celia P. Roger Hunt. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.25.
Wright, W. A. The Works of William Shakspere. Vol. V. Macmillan & Co. $3.

MARCH

EDUCATIONAL REVIEW.

ARTICLES.—John Amos Comenius, the Editors; The Place of Comenius in the History of Education, S. S. Laurie; The Text-Books of Comenius, C. W. Bardeen; The Permanent Influence of Comenius, Paul H. Hanus; The Catholic Controversy about Education, John A. Mooney; The Museum in Educational Work, Frederick Starr.
DISCUSSIONS.—The Best Method of Appointing Teachers in the Public Schools, I., Joseph C. Hendrix; Old and New Methods in Geometry, George C. Shattus; The Value of Practice Teaching in Normal Schools, V., John W. Cook.
EDUCATION IN FOREIGN PERIODICALS.—The Place of the Classical Languages in Modern Schools, Oscar Browning.
REVIEWS—EDITORIALS.

$3 a year (monthly, except Aug. and Sept.). 35c. a number.

HENRY HOLT & CO., New York

Economic History Since 1763.

Selections illustrating Economic History since the Seven Years' War. Compiled by Benjamin Rand, Ph.D. Second edition, revised and enlarged. 8vo, pp. 567. $3.00.

This work includes the following important subjects: European Colonial Policy, The Great Inventions, Economic Causes of the French Revolution, The Edicts of Stein and Hardenberg, The Orders in Council, The Finances of England, La Politique de la Restauration, The Zollverein, The Corn Laws, The New Gold, France sous le Second Empire, Recent Changes in Transportation, The French Indemnity, The Liquidations of 1873-76, The United States in 1880, Les Dettes Publiques, The World's Progress in Trade and Industry. App.: English and American Navigation Acts, The American Civil War, Growth of Canada, The United States in 1890.

JOHN WILSON & SON,
University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Dainty Foods Demand it.

IN EVERY Receipt that calls for baking powder, use the "Royal." Better results will be obtained because it is the purest. It will make the food lighter, sweeter, of finer flavor, more digestible and wholesome. It is always reliable and uniform in its work.

I have found the Royal Baking Powder superior to all others.
C. GORJU,
Late *Chef*, Delmonico's.

Exhaustion.

HORSFORD'S ACID PHOSPHATE.

A wonderful remedy, of the highest value in mental and nervous exhaustion.

Overworked men and women, the nervous, weak, and debilitated, will find in the Acid Phosphate a most agreeable, grateful, and harmless stimulant, giving renewed strength and vigor to the entire system.

Dr. Edwin F. Vose, Portland, Me., says: "I have used it in my own case when suffering from nervous exhaustion, with gratifying results. I have prescribed it for many of the various forms of nervous debility, and it has never failed to do good"

Descriptive pamphlet free.

Rumford Chemical Works, Providence, R. I.

Beware of Substitutes and Imitations.

CAUTION: Be sure the word "Horsford's" is on the label. All others are spurious. Never sold in bulk.

Letters of Credit. We buy and sell bills of exchange on and make Cable Transfers of money to Europe, Australia, and the West Indies; also make Collections and issue Commercial and Travelers' Credits, available in all parts of the world.

Brown Brothers & Co., Bankers,

NO. 59 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

BACK NUMBERS, VOLUMES, OR sets of leading and scarce magazines, etc., for sale by H. WILLIAMS, 195 West 10th St., N. Y.

BRIGHT'S DISEASE is eliminated from the system by BUFFALO LITHIA WATER.

"The weary brain requires some nerve sustaining element as food."—HERBERT SPENCER.

Crosby's Vitalized Phosphites.

The vital principle of animal and vegetable life isolated from the ox brain and wheat germ.

The loss of memory, the tired and exhausted feeling, the dull, unrefreshed sleep, or nervous sleeplessness, brain weariness, depressed vitality, are simply the brain and nervous system calling for their necessary food. In this condition the Vitalized Phosphites give great relief. It restores the true protagon, the brain phosphoid, increases brain and nerve power by specially feeding the nerve centres. It reinvigorates brain and body.

For thirty years endorsed by leading physicians, and the world's best brain workers. Formula on the label. Pamphlet free to those who write for it. Druggists or by mail, $1.00. 56 W. 25th St., N. Y. *F. Crosby Co.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

B. WESTERMANN & CO.,

Booksellers and Importers,

812 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

NOW READY:

FLÜGEL'S Great Dictionary. German-English. A stout 4to volume of viii+923 pages. Full sheep, $5.50; half morocco, $6.00. English-German. Two stout volumes. Full sheep, $11.00, half morocco, $12.00.

MÜLLER, SIMONIS, and HYVERNAT Du Caucase au Golfe Persique, Relation des Missions Scientifiques. A splendid 4to volume, handsomely illustrated, with Notes on the Geography and History of Ancient Armenia and cuneiform Inscriptions. In paper, $9.00.

BRÜCKE. The Human Figure: Its Beauties and Defects. With Preface by W. Anderson. With 29 Illustrations. London and New York. Cloth, $3.00.

GUSTAV E. STECHERT,

Importer of Books and Periodicals

REMOVAL.

The constant increase of my business has made it necessary for me to take larger and more spacious localities.

I therefore have removed my business to

810 BROADWAY, Two Doors above Grace Church.

Thanking you for past favors and soliciting your further patronage, I remain, Yours truly,

GUSTAV E. STECHERT. 810 Broadway, New York.

BRANCHES:

London: 30 Wellington Street, Strand, W. C.
Leipzig: 10 Hospital Strasse.

S. B. LUYSTER,

98 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK,
AND LONDON, ENGLAND.

Importer of Standard English Books,

OLD AND NEW.

Catalogues issued bi-monthly, and sent gratis to any address, on application.

Official Gazette of the U. S. Patent Office, complete set from beginning 1872 to 1890 inclusive, bound in full sheep. 72 vols. $200.

Official Records of Union and Confederate ARMIES, complete so far as published. 72 books. Cloth, $62.00.

W. H. LOWDERMILK & CO.,

DEALERS IN U. S. GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS,

1424 and 1426 F Street, Washington, D. C.

RARE BOOKS,

AUTOGRAPHS AND PORTRAITS.

Send stamp for separate lists.
Picking up Scarce Books a specialty.
Address AMERICAN PRESS CO., Baltimore, Md.

F. W. CHRISTERN,

254 Fifth Ave., between 28th and 29th Sts., New York, Importer of Foreign Books, Agent for the leading Paris Publishers, Tauchnitz's British Authors, Teubner's Greek and Latin Classics. Catalogues of stock mailed on demand. A large assortment always on hand, and new books received from Paris and Leipzig as soon as issued.

PRINTS, ELIZABETHAN LITERATURE. BOOKS.

Brentano's will send to any address upon request a descriptive catalogue of rare and curious books, including a collection of prints, play-bills, and clippings relating to Vauxhall Gardens, works on Shakespeare and Elizabethan literature, etc., forming part of their recent purchases from some notable libraries.

BRENTANO'S, 124 5th Ave., New York.

BOOKS WANTED.

We are prepared to buy FOR CASH at full market rates large or small libraries of books. Executors or others address

FRANCIS P. HARPER, 17 East 16th St., N. Y.

AUTOGRAPH LETTERS.

Send for my Price-Lists.

WALTER R. BENJAMIN,

28 West 23d Street, New York City.

Foreign Books. Subscription to foreign periodicals, Tauchnitz British Authors. Catalogues on application. CARL SCHOENHOF, 144 Tremont St., Boston.

BACK NUMBERS OF MAGAZINES and Reviews, both early and recent, NATION included, as also a choice collection of Books and Pamphlets. Catalogues free.

A. S. CLARK, 34 Park Row, N. Y. City.

An Educational Directory.

I. THE NATION has the largest circulation of any literary and political journal published in this country. The 10,000 copies printed every week represent but a small part of the actual circulation, as THE NATION goes to all the principal libraries and reading-rooms, and into thousands of families.

II. The circulation is chiefly among the thinking and well-to-do classes—lawyers, physicians, bankers, and other professional men—and in the homes of cultivated people, where the education of children is a matter of careful consideration.

III. The School List in THE NATION has been a representative one for many years. It includes cards of most of the prominent educational institutions everywhere, during the season of school advertising, and a considerable number are inserted in the paper throughout the year.

School advertisements are printed in a uniform typography, with the address in the first line, classification being made by States, alphabetically, unless especially ordered displayed on other pages.

Advertising rates, 15 cents an agate line each insertion, with the following discounts: 5 per cent. on four insertions, 10 per cent. on 8 insertions, 12 1-2 per cent. on 13 insertions, 15 per cent. on 26 insertions, 20 per cent. on 39 insertions, 25 per cent. on 52 insertions.

The *Nation* is sent free while advertisement continues.

Orders may be forwarded through any responsible advertising agency, or directly to

THE NATION, 206 to 210 Broadway, N. Y.

KNABE

PIANOFORTES,

UNUQUALLED IN

TONE, TOUCH, WORKMANSHIP, AND DURABILITY.

Baltimore. 22 and 24 E. Baltimore St. New York. 148 5th Ave., near 20th St. Washington, 817 Market Place.

Sun Painting.

The question where to go in order to obtain a good photograph is not a momentous one when it is known that the Studio of Pach Bros., the Artistic Photographers, who have won golden opinions for their skill, is located at 935 Broadway, corner 22d St. Their instantaneous photographs of children are unexcelled. Groups of families and friends a specialty. Pach Bros. point with pride to their selection as class photographers by the leading colleges of the country.

For convenience of subscribers wishing to permanently and uniformly bind their volumes, we can now furnish

Covers for the Nation,

in regular book form, ready for use by any bookbinder, who will put in the numbers for a small charge. These have black cloth sides, roan back and corners, and are stamped in gold on back THE NATION and the number of the volume. Price 60 cents each, postpaid.

These covers will fit all volumes from XXXIII. to LII., *i. e.*, since the increase in size to 24 pages each issue. (For the earlier volumes we cannot furnish covers.) In ordering, state the volume-number wanted. Address

THE NATION, BOX 794, New York.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED